

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Wednesday, July 24, 1985

The House met at 10 a.m.

The Chaplain, Rev. James David Ford, D.D., offered the following prayer:

We pray, O God, for all those to whom great responsibility has been given. May Your guiding and comforting spirit be with the women and men who have been chosen to lead our Nation in the paths of peace. Give them wisdom to understand Your will and the strength to lead lives of service. Bless the Members of this assembly and their families. Keep them ever in Your grace, and may Your abiding love never depart from them. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Sparrow, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 2370. An act to amend the Public Health Service Act to extend the programs of assistance for nurse education; and

H.R. 2409. An act to amend the Public Health Service Act to revise and extend the authorities under that Act relating to the National Institutes of Health and National Research Institutes, and for other purposes.

ELIMINATING THE SYNTHETIC FUELS CORPORATION

(Mr. SYNAR asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SYNAR. Mr. Speaker, in a matter of hours, we are going to have a unique opportunity, for today, we will be voting on the Interior appropriations rule which has turned out to be the decision on whether or not we will continue the Synthetic Fuels Corporation.

The vote is not a small vote. It is a vote for \$6 billion, one of the largest individual budget cuts this Congress will face this year.

Ladies and gentlemen, the Synthetic Fuels Corporation in this country has been a failure. It is the most wasteful and unproductive agency in our Federal Government. I hope that my colleagues will take this opportunity to

end the Synthetic Fuels Corporation later today by overturning the rule and allowing us a vote on this very important issue.

ENDING THE SYNTHETIC FUELS CORPORATION

(Mr. BLILEY asked and was permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BLILEY. Mr. Speaker, today we will be taking up H.R. 3011, the Interior and related agencies' fiscal year 1985 appropriations bill.

I am speaking today to urge my colleagues on my side of the aisle, as the distinguished gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. SYNAR], my friend, just urged Members on his side, in a bipartisan effort to vote against the rule, to vote against the rule to make in order an amendment that would allow the rescission of all but \$500 million from the Synthetic Fuels Corporation.

The Synthetic Fuels Corporation has compiled a record of inaction, excessive salaries and pensions and has not brought the commercialization of synfuels 1 day closer to reality.

If the Congress does not act swiftly, billions of dollars may be obligated by the Synthetic Fuels Corporation without any congressional review. The full House should have the opportunity to vote on the rescission of synfuels.

The vote last year shows that most Members favor rescission. Rescinding money from the synthetic fuels fund in an appropriations bill is the only way, the only sure way to force the other body to deal with the synthetic fuels issue.

PAY EQUITY

(Mr. GARCIA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GARCIA. Mr. Speaker, we pride ourselves of being part of a nation which places great importance on fairness and equity. As a nation we have come a long way to correct unfairness in our society, but as they say, we have a long way to go.

Pay equity is an issue of discrimination which we, as legislators, must try to resolve. Discrimination is ingrained in the existing wage system of our Federal Government and it is hurting American women, especially those in the lower rung of the pay scale.

Many cities and States have taken a lead in implementing pay equity policies to eliminate wage discrimination

in the local and State governments. Should not the Federal Government examine its own wage system, and follow the example being set by such cities and States?

The Federal Government is the largest employer of women, but the majority of the women employees are at the lower end of the pay scale. Those who argue against pay equity say that our market system placed women in particular job fields which just happens to pay less than the job fields dominated by men. However, most women are in the lower paying jobs because those jobs traditionally held by women have been under valued.

Many argue against pay equity contending that it will cost too much. Must we let the forces of free market go uncontrolled? Further, on the issue of costs to implement pay equity—should we not place equity and justice above and beyond monetary value?

We must start taking action to assure that the Federal Government examines its wage system to eliminate wage discrimination. It's our job, and it's our responsibility.

COMPARABLE WORTH

(Mr. ARMEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, one of the things we must always keep in mind is the fact that as the Federal Government enters the labor force, hiring labor, it must compete with the market across the economy, with the private sector. The fact of the matter is the market differentiates between different occupations and jobs by assigning them different wages.

People in this country are guaranteed, and this Government has done a great deal to assure, the right to freely make their occupational choice. As a result of those choices, people of similar circumstance and preference find themselves collected into different kinds of occupations at different wage rates. As we recognize this, the thing we must never forget is the individual American has the right and exercises the right to choose the job to which they will apply.

Our job as a government is to guarantee their right to access to employment, to guarantee them equal pay for equal work. We have been doing a good job of that and nobody is complaining of our failure to do so.

The largest voice in America for that right has been the women of America

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by the Member on the floor.

arguing for equal pay for equal work and they have, in recent years, made significant progress. Today now, we entertain the possibility of a law that will stall that progress and diminish the willingness and the ability of women to move to nontraditional occupations. It is called variously pay equity or comparable worth. But the upshot of it is for the Government to override the market, to establish a system of Government fiat wage determination that will totally disregard the ability of the market to differentiate between occupations, and the rights of individuals to choose those occupations most advantageous to their individual sense of value and purpose.

IN SUPPORT OF PAY EQUITY

(Ms. KAPTUR asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service will mark up H.R. 3008 today. I would urge my colleagues to keep an open mind on the issue of pay equity—at least until the committee finishes its work and brings a bill to the floor. There are those who are putting out much misinformation on this legislation. I would urge my colleagues to consider the facts.

H.R. 3008 simply calls for a study of the Federal pay and classification system to determine if discrimination exists based on sex, race, or ethnic origin. A study, Mr. Speaker, only a study. What are opponents of this legislation afraid of? I believe their confusion stems from circumstances which occurred in the State of Washington. When one looks into the situation there, it becomes clear that enormous sums required to implement pay equity in that State stem, not from the job evaluation study, but rather, from a court decision awarding back pay.

Mr. Speaker, all but five of the States have addressed this issue. Some 39 have done research, while 22 are currently conducting evaluations of the pay classifications of State employees. In addition, seven States are implementing pay equity adjustments as a result of such studies. These States include: Idaho, Iowa, Wisconsin, Minnesota, New Mexico, South Dakota, and Washington. In my home State of Ohio, we have conducted a pilot job evaluation study, done extensive research in this area, and established a task force on the issue.

Given that a recent GAO study found that federally employed women earn an average of 62.8 cents for every dollar earned by federally employed men, I believe this proposal for a study deserves our serious consideration.

TRIBUTE TO DR. CAROLYNE K. DAVIS

(Mr. PURSELL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PURSELL. Mr. Speaker, today I'd like to recognize one of the most outstanding members of the Reagan administration, Dr. Carolyn K. Davis, who is announcing her decision to end her long and distinguished leadership of the Health Care Financing Administration.

Dr. Davis held that post longer than any other administrator. I think it has been obvious to all who have observed her work that the taxpayers and all of us in Congress have been fortunate to have her leading such an important and sensitive agency.

Dr. Davis is a long time associate of mine, and I'm proud to call her my friend. She is a former vice president of the University of Michigan, and her list of academic, professional, and personal accomplishments cannot be listed in such a brief comment. It is sufficient to say that Carolyn Davis is one of the most brilliant and able people I have ever known.

□ 1010

On behalf of my colleagues, particularly Congressman MICHEL, Congressman BROYHILL, Congressman GEORGE O'BRIEN, Congressman EARLY, and I am sure Congressman BOLAND, and others, we will miss her here and hope she returns to help this great Nation in some deserving capacity.

LET US VOTE ON DAVIS-BACON REFORM

(Mr. RAY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RAY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my strong hope that this House will be given the opportunity to vote on the Davis-Bacon reform language which was added by the Senate to the Defense authorization bill. We will probably complete action on the DOD conference report before we recess next week, and I urge the conferees to allow the full House to vote on this important issue.

The Davis-Bacon Act was enacted in the 1930's, during the Great Depression, and requires that locally prevailing wages be paid on Federal contracts. The definition of "locally prevailing wages" was not specifically set out in the law, and, since the 1930's, the well intentioned Davis-Bacon requirements have produced a needless paperwork burden, particularly on small businesses. They have encouraged high unemployment rates in many places, especially in rural areas, and they have added more than \$1 billion to Federal construction costs.

The House has never voted on Davis-Bacon reform, only on repeal and exemption. Now is the time, however, to review this out-of-date provision of the law and to improve it. I believe that this action will remove barriers to small business participation in the contracting process and will result in more jobs, reduced paperwork, and a lower Federal deficit.

AMERICAN HELD HOSTAGE IN LEBANON 444 DAYS

(Mr. O'BRIEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. O'BRIEN. Mr. Speaker, Friday will be the 444th day since Rev. Benjamin Weir was taken hostage by gunmen on the streets of Beirut.

Four hundred and forty-four days. The same number of days the American Embassy was held hostage in Iran 5 years ago.

Four hundred and forty-four days. That's 1 year, 2 months, and 3 weeks.

Not since May 1984 has Reverend Weir had any contact with the outside world. The Red Cross has never visited Reverend Weir.

Another American, William Buckley, will have been held hostage 500 days next Monday.

Sunday will mark the 200th day my good friend, Father Lawrence Jenco, has been held hostage in Lebanon.

Today is the 130th day of captivity for Terry Anderson, the Associated Press bureau chief in Beirut.

Today is the 57th day of captivity for David Jacobsen of Huntington Beach, CA.

Thomas Sutherland, of Fort Collins, CO, was kidnapped by Muslim gunmen on June 9, 6 days before TWA flight 847 was hijacked. Today is the 44th day Sutherland has been held hostage.

Today also marks the 232d day since the disappearance of Peter Kilburn of San Francisco, CA.

Mr. Speaker, what's the difference between an American Embassy being held hostage in Iran for 444 days and an American citizen being held hostage in Lebanon for 444 days? The hostage crisis is not over.

GASOLINE PRICE TYRANNY OF THE OIL COMPANIES DESPITE DECLINE OF CRUDE OIL PRICES, PRICE OF GASOLINE AT THE PUMP IS GOING UP, NOT DOWN

(Mr. OBERSTAR asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Speaker, pity the poor oil companies. They've had to raise the price of gasoline to boost their sagging profits. Yesterday, five

oil companies reported over \$2 billion in profits for the second quarter of this year.

A worldwide glut of crude oil has triggered a continuing decline of crude oil prices over the last several months. Yet, consumers have seen the price of gasoline at the pump go up, not down.

The free marketeers have always argued that ending Government controls would stimulate increased crude oil production, which, in turn, would drive retail gasoline prices down. That, perhaps, is what should happen in a free market; but it hasn't. On the contrary; the oil companies have suspended the laws of competition and the marketplace. They have used their virtual monopoly position as processors to reduce the production of gasoline, artificially driving up its price and their profits.

In the process, they have denied consumers any share in the economic benefits of conservation, which should have resulted in financial savings for consumers. Instead, deregulation of crude oil controls and gasoline prices has become a Trojan horse for taking the public interest out of gasoline pricing and substituting for it the profit tyranny of the oil companies.

REPUBLICANS 9, DEMOCRATS 3

(Mr. COATS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. COATS. Mr. Speaker, for those of our colleagues who have not yet heard and for the millions of Americans who were not able to pick up their sports page this morning to find out the results, let me just report: Republicans 9, Democrats 3.

THE OUTRAGEOUSLY WASTEFUL SYNTHETIC FUELS CORPORATION

(Mr. WOLPE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WOLPE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to urge my colleagues to vote "no" on the rule for consideration of the Interior appropriations bill. This is more than a procedural vote.

By defeating the rule, we will have the opportunity to prevent the outrageously wasteful Synthetic Fuels Corporation from squandering \$6 billion.

The supporters of the SFC will no doubt make references to Khomeini and Qadhafi and the threat of future oil embargoes. Their concern is well-founded but the SFC is not the answer. To the contrary, allowing the SFC to waste \$6 billion will only make us more vulnerable.

I urge my colleagues to take a close look at the SFC's abominable record and its very dim prospects for future

success. If you do so, you will conclude that allowing the SFC to continue with its grandiose spending plans will not add to our security.

It will diminish our security and add only to our Federal deficits.

I strongly urge our colleagues to vote "no" on the rule today.

LET'S HEAR NO EXCUSES, MR. SPEAKER

(Mr. PORTER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, it appears all but certain that Congress will recess next week without writing a budget. Once again, our kids will pick up the bill. While we're out on recess, the Government will run up another \$20 billion in debt. That will cost each child, over a lifetime, an extra \$1,000 in taxes. That's quite an expensive vacation we're taking.

The American people don't want to hear any excuses, Mr. Speaker—from you or any of us—about why we couldn't reach an agreement. I know why. It's because you insisted on your spending increases. Had you been willing to accept an across-the-board freeze, plus some fairly applied cuts, I have a hunch we would have a compromise budget.

As it is, Mr. Speaker, you will have an obligation to this Congress—and, more important, to America's children—to come up with a \$56 billion deficit reduction package. In hard numbers. With binding reconciliation.

If you can't, it's because you won't. And don't blame anyone else but yourself.

WE MUST VOTE "NO" ON INTERIOR APPROPRIATIONS RULE

(Mr. SHARP asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. SHARP. Mr. Speaker, today we will have one of the most important opportunities we will have in this session of Congress to cut future deficits by as much as \$6 billion. But to get that opportunity we must vote "no" on the Interior appropriations bill.

Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen, the Synthetic Fuels Program, as administered by the Synthetic Fuels Corporation, cannot be justified by the energy picture we are facing, it cannot be justified by the performance of the Synthetic Fuels Corporation, it cannot be justified in the face of the massive deficits that we are going to be seeing for the next several years.

If we are not willing to cut the pork barrel and cut the Synthetic Fuels Program, when I think Members of the House are going to have to be willing to raise taxes.

ONE OF THE WORST BOONDOGGLES IN THE HISTORY OF THIS COUNTRY—SYNTHETIC FUELS CORPORATION

(Mr. DREIER of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DREIER of California. Mr. Speaker, as the unfortunate stalemate over the budget continues, we have seen by these 1-minute this morning that there is going to be a great opportunity for Democrats and Republicans alike to lay the ground work to cut up to \$6 billion from future deficits by attempting to eliminate one of the worst boondoggles in the history of this country. I speak of the Synthetic Fuels Corporation.

To do that we must vote "no" on the Interior appropriations rule. I urge my colleagues to do just that.

□ 1020

COSPONSOR LEGISLATION TO REMOVE THE SO-CALLED PHANTOM TAX

(Mr. BOSCO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BOSCO. Mr. Speaker, with all the concern in Congress over tax fairness, I am sure my colleagues will be interested in a startling new report issued today by the Environmental Action Foundation.

Last year, the Nation's 125 largest electric utilities billed their ratepayers for \$7.4 billion in Federal taxes that the utilities did not end up paying the Government. This so-called phantom tax occurred due to provisions of the 1981 Tax Act that allow utilities to charge customers for taxes without passing on benefits the utilities received under the act.

In my area of northern California, the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. was No. 1 in the Nation, charging customers \$497 million for taxes last year—yet the utilities tax form showed it actually received a \$29 million tax refund for the same period.

Industrial and residential customers paid on the average \$33 in higher electric bills in 1984 due to the phantom tax, and the total indirect and direct costs to households exceeds \$100 annually.

Mr. Speaker, this multimillion-dollar slight of hand is an unfair tax on all American consumers and businesses. I urge my colleagues to join with Messrs. DORGAN, PEASE, STARK, and myself in cosponsoring legislation to remedy this unfairness in our tax laws.

DIVORCE OURSELVES FROM "CONSTRUCTIVE ENGAGEMENT"

(Mr. MILLER of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, under the guise of an emergency order, the Government of South Africa has once again unleashed state sponsored repression.

South Africa is a country where you can be jailed for objecting to repression, arrested for reporting repression, and hanged for fighting repression.

The goal of the mass arrests and the denial of civil liberties is simple: to silence the demands of the black majority for an end to apartheid.

Both Houses of Congress have passed legislation condemning apartheid and halting U.S. economic support to the Nation that promotes it.

But the administration opposes taking real action. The administration insists on its policy of "constructive engagement."

Mr. Speaker, I believe I speak for the majority of this House, and the majority of Americans, when I say:

"We do not want to be 'engaged' to apartheid in any fashion.

"We must divorce ourselves from apartheid and from the police-state that enforces it."

TWO "NO" VOTES REQUIRED TO STOP SYNFUELS

(Mr. WALKER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, we have a couple of actions before us today. I join with my colleagues who want us to defeat the rule with regard to the Interior appropriations, but I suggest to those people who are concerned about Synfuels that they had better also defeat the measure with regard to the Budget Procedures Act.

Because if we allow the Budget Procedures Act question to go through, what could happen is that that Interior appropriation bill could come to the floor; they would have the provision in there that points of order could be made against the legislation in an appropriations bill, but nevertheless the Interior appropriations bill could be brought to the floor under the Budget Procedures Act.

I would suggest to all those people who are concerned about doing something about Synfuels, if you really want to cast votes that are aimed at reducing the deficit, you have got to vote against both the Budget Procedures Act and the rule on the Interior appropriations bill to get to this problem.

If you do only one, you will set up a scenario whereby the Interior appropriations bill could come to the floor

and we would not be able to touch the Synfuels Corporation.

So I say to my colleagues, you have got to vote against both the Budget Procedures Act and the Interior rule in order to get at Synfuels. Otherwise, you are going to set a scenario whereby the process could go forward and we would not get to vote on the \$6 billion for Synfuels.

DISMISSING THE ELECTION CONTEST AGAINST BEN BLAZ

Mr. JONES of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up a privileged resolution (H. Res. 229) dismissing the election contest against BEN BLAZ, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 229

Resolved, That the election contest of Antonio Borja Won Pat, contestant, against Ben Blaz, contestee, relating to the office of Delegate from Guam, is dismissed.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. JONES] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. JONES of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes, for the purpose of debate only, to the gentleman from Nevada [Mrs. VUCANOVICH], and pending that, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 229 is a resolution to dismiss the election contest regarding the position of Delegate from the Territory of Guam.

Under the U.S. Constitution and the rules of the House, the Committee on House Administration is charged with the responsibility for investigating contested elections.

On July 10 the Committee on House Administration, by unanimous voice vote, directed me to bring to the floor this resolution dismissing the election contest of Antonio Won Pat against BEN BLAZ.

Pursuant to the Rules of the committee, Chairman ANNUNZIO established a task force to examine the documentary record, and to receive oral arguments from contestant and contestee. I chaired the task force, serving with me were Mr. GEJDESON and Mr. BADHAM.

After presentation of oral arguments, and examination of the record, the task force determined that the contestant did not meet his burden of presenting sufficient documentary and other evidence to warrant further proceedings. The task force then unanimously recommended dismissal of the contest, and the committee also by unanimous vote, ordered this dismissal resolution reported to the House.

Although contestant Won Pat raised a number of issues regarding the administration of the election, which the committee hopes will be addressed by

the Guam Election Commission before the next election, the committee concluded that the issues raised were not sufficient to overturn the outcome of the election. The initial count of ballots, and two subsequent recounts, provided contestee BLAZ with a winning margin of approximately 350 votes out of 31,000 cast.

The two principal issues raised by contestant were the late mailing of absentee ballots, and an interpretation by the Guam Election Commission of the election statute. Let me first address the absentee ballot question.

The task force found that no absentee ballots were sent out until October 16, 1984. Thereafter they were sent out as applications were received, right up to the week before the election.

The voters were instructed to return the absentee ballots as soon as possible, and were also instructed that absentee ballots received after election day would not be counted. Nearly two-thirds of the ballots sent out were returned by election day, and were included in the final tally. Late arriving ballots were not counted.

Given the late date on which absentee ballots were sent out, 21 days before the election compared to the 45 days recommended by the Voting Assistance Office of the Pentagon, some voters may not have been able to timely return their ballots. The committee hopes that the Guam Election Commission will establish procedures for future elections which allow substantially more transit time than was provided in the last general election, so as to avoid the possible disenfranchisement of overseas voters. Nevertheless, the committee does not believe contestant's claim requires that the election be invalidated. Invalidating an election is a radical step. There is no reason for believing that delay in sending out the absentee ballots had an impact on the result of the election. If there were a problem the contestant should have sought relief before the election.

The contestant's second contention is that blank ballots and overvotes should be included in the total number of "votes cast." That would deprive contestee of the absolute majority, required by the Guam statute.

In interpreting a similar statutory provision governing elections in the Virgin Islands, a Federal court of appeals rejected the argument that such ballots should be included in the total of votes cast. The committee found the court's reasoning to be persuasive and affirmed the decision of the Guam Election Commission.

The committee reviewed the other arguments put forth by contestant, but found that the various issues raised were not, individually or collectively, sufficient to change the result of the election.

Consequently the committee recommends that the House adopt the resolution dismissing the election contest.

□ 1030

Mr. BADHAM. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the resolution. As was stated by the gentleman from Tennessee, the task force met and heard oral arguments from the counsels for both parties and in a later meeting voted unanimously to dismiss the contest.

Briefly, Mr. Speaker, the contestant's allegations were that the rights of absentee voters were deprived by acts of election officials and that the contestee did not receive a majority of the votes cast in this election. Additionally, the contestant raised certain other allegations of irregularities in the Guam election process.

First, the allegation was made that the low rate of return of the ballots was because the first ballots were not mailed to the absentee voters until October 16 and that the mailing of the absentee ballots were not completed until October 31. Therefore, there was not enough time to complete and return the ballots in a timely manner. Counsel for the contestee presented the task force with an affidavit from the employee of the Guam Election Commission who spoke with the Postal Service representative who had advised her that if the absentee ballots were sent out by October 21 and if they were expeditiously returned by the voter the ballots should be back in time to be counted in the general election. In addition, Mr. Speaker, the absentee voter was advised several times within the absentee mailing to return the ballot immediately.

The contestant's second allegation that the contestee did not receive a majority of the votes cast. They contend that the "majority" must be computed to include ballots cast that were marked for both candidates—over-votes—or neither candidate—blank ballots. Further, the contestant believes that the absentee ballots which were postmarked prior to November 6, but received after the close of the polls are "votes cast."

Mr. Speaker, there was a similar case decided in 1982 in an election for Governor and Lieutenant Governor of the Virgin Islands. The court was faced with the issue of whether blank and spoiled ballots should be counted in determining the majority of the votes cast. In the *Totman versus Boschulte* opinion, the Court quoted an earlier decision (*Euvema v. Todman*, 8 V.I. 224 (D.V.I. 1971)) which stated that "The proper basis for computing a majority" was that "voters not attending the election or not voting on the matter submitted are presumed to assent to the expressed will of those attending and voting and are not to be

taken into consideration in determining the result." Additionally, the Guam Election Commission legal counsel advised the commission of a legal opinion written 2 years ago that blank ballots and those with voted too many should not be counted.

Mr. Speaker, I don't believe it is necessary to take any more of the House's time on the resolution and would urge its adoption.

Mr. JONES of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. JONES of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the resolution just agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GRAY of Illinois). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

PROVIDING SPECIAL BUDGET PROCEDURES FOR FISCAL YEAR 1986 CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET PROCESS

Mr. DERRICK. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 231 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 231

Resolved, That, for the purposes of the provisions of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (Public Law 93-344), as they apply to the House of Representatives, the Congress shall be considered to have adopted H. Con. Res. 152, revising the congressional budget for the United States Government for the fiscal year 1985 and setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for the fiscal years 1986, 1987, and 1988, as adopted by the House on May 23, 1985. For the purposes of this resolution, the allocations of budget authority and new entitlement authority printed in the Congressional Record of July 23, 1985 by Representative Gray of Pennsylvania, shall be considered as allocations made pursuant to section 302(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (Public Law 93-344).

SEC. 2. This resolution shall cease to apply upon final adoption by the House and the Senate of a concurrent resolution on the budget for the applicable fiscal year or years.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. DERRICK] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. DERRICK. Mr. Speaker, I yield the customary 30 minutes, for the purpose of debate only, to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. LATTI], and pending that, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, yesterday, the Committee on Rules reported House Resolution 231, providing special budget procedures for the fiscal year 1986 congressional budget process. This is a matter of original jurisdiction for the Rules Committee. House Resolution 231 provides that the House-passed budget resolution for fiscal year 1986, House Concurrent Resolution 152, will be considered to be adopted by the Congress for purposes of the Congressional Budget Act, as it applies to the House of Representatives. House Resolution 231 states that the allocation of spending totals among House committees printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of July 23, 1985, by Representative GRAY, chairman of the Budget Committee, will be considered as the allocation required by section 302(a) of the Budget Act. Finally, Mr. Speaker, if the two Houses agree on a budget resolution for fiscal year 1986, the provisions of House 231 would cease to apply.

Mr. Speaker, the Budget Act was created in order to allow Congress to set some overall limits on spending and revenue and to set priorities for the way that funds would be spent. To make sure that these limits have some real meaning, that all of the pain we go through in adopting a budget resolution actually will help to control spending and revenues, section 303 of the Budget Act provides that spending and revenue legislation cannot be considered until Congress has agreed on those overall limits in a budget resolution. You cannot very well enforce limits on spending if you have already spent most of your money before you decide on those limits. Of course, the Budget Act also requires that the budget resolution be adopted by May 15.

But here we are on July 24, with no budget resolution agreed to. I am a member of the conference committee on the budget, and I can assure you that we have tried mightily to produce a budget agreement, but so far it has been beyond our power. I still hope that we will reach agreement, but we do not have one now and I cannot honestly say that one is just around the corner.

This means we are faced with a dilemma. We simply cannot afford to wait any longer to move forward with consideration of the 13 general appropriation bills and other spending legislation. If we delay any longer, we are simply insuring that the Government will be funded by a massive continuing resolution. The business of the Government must move forward at some point, even if we have not been able to

agree to a budget resolution. On October 1, funding for most of the Government stops, regardless of the status of the budget resolution. On the other hand, we cannot afford simply to throw up our hands and surrender to the \$200 billion deficits facing us and give up the constraints provided by the Budget Act.

The resolution before us today offers a compromise solution to this dilemma. The solution is not perfect. A perfect solution would be that we have a budget resolution in place which eliminates the deficit. But this resolution allows the House to move forward with the business of providing funds for the Government, while imposing the constraints of the only budget resolution we have: The budget passed by this House on May 23. This resolution will allow the appropriation bills and other spending bills to move forward without waivers of the Budget Act, but it will activate all of the enforcement provisions of the Budget Act to ensure that these bills stay within the limits that this House agreed to in its budget resolution.

If House Resolution 231 is adopted, the regular scorekeeping procedures will be set in motion. Members will have the information necessary to compare spending bills with the overall spending totals in the House-passed resolution. Chairman GRAY printed in yesterday's CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the allocations of new budget authority and new entitlement authority among House committees. The House committees, pursuant to section 302(b) of the Budget Act, will subdivide their allocations among their subcommittees or by program and report these subdivisions promptly to the House. The Appropriations Committee has this morning made available a tentative version of its 302(b) subdivisions. The subdivision to be provided today is necessarily tentative because the Appropriations Committee has not had sufficient time to meet and formally approve it. It is my understanding, however, that the final subdivision is not likely to be significantly different.

House Resolution 231 would also set in motion the reconciliation process. In effect, House Resolution 231 gives force to the reconciliation directive included in the House Resolution 231 gives force to the reconciliation directive included in House Concurrent Resolution 52, the House-passed budget resolution, which instructs 10 committees of the House to report reconciliation legislation not later than 30 calendar days after final action on the resolution. If House Resolution 231 is adopted, the 30-day clock begins running today.

Adoption of this resolution will also bring into effect the Budget Act constraints on total spending and on revenues. In accordance with section 311 of the Budget Act and the provisions

of the House-passed budget resolution, beginning October 1, 1985, a point of order will lie against any measure that would cause the spending totals or revenue floor set in House Concurrent Resolution 152 to be breached.

Mr. Speaker, House Rule XLIX provides that a joint resolution changing the debt limit shall be deemed to have passed the House if Congress adopts a budget resolution which recommends a change in the statutory limit on the debt. The resolution we are considering today does not trigger this procedure. If House Resolution 231 is adopted, the House-passed budget resolution will be deemed to have been adopted by Congress for purposes of the Budget Act, but not for purposes of House Rule XLIX.

To date, Mr. Speaker, three general appropriation bills for fiscal year 1986 have been considered and approved by the House. Three more have been reported by the Appropriations Committee and are awaiting consideration by the House. Therefore, out of a total of 13 general appropriation bills, only three have cleared the House and three more are pending.

With the start of the next fiscal year on October 1, 1985, and an intervening congressional recess during the month of August, it is apparent that we are far behind in our annual appropriations process.

Mr. Speaker, we are in a predicament. The budget conference is stalled. The House must act on appropriation measures but the House should not act without the constraint and guidance offered by a budget resolution. This is our situation. I wish it were not. The best we can do, I submit, is to use the House-passed budget resolution to get the ball rolling on reconciliation, to put in motion the regular scorekeeping procedures, and to place overall limits on spending. That is what House Resolution 231 does. I urge its adoption.

□ 1040

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, let me say I rise in opposition to the resolution.

In our discussion on this issue, I think we ought to start by being honest about the nature of the resolution itself. It is, in effect, a waiver of the Budget Act. Let us get that straight. More specifically, it has the effect of waiving the requirements that final action be completed on the budget resolution before the House may proceed to consider general appropriation bills.

This resolution eliminates certain Budget Act restraints on not just one, not just two, not just three, but all—all—the general appropriation bills for fiscal year 1986.

House Resolution 231 does all this by providing that the first budget res-

olution for fiscal year 1986 as passed by the House will be considered to have been adopted by both Congress of the Congress. If we once accept this pretense that a budget resolution has been agreed to, then there is no need to waive points of order for lack of a real budget agreement.

Mr. Speaker, not only is this a blanket waiver of section 303(a), the Budget Act requirement that a budget resolution be in place before appropriation bills can be considered, but for the first time this year, it actually would permit spending increase amendments to be offered to general appropriation bills.

Under current procedure, even though the House may waive section 303(a) of the Budget Act against individual appropriation bills, such waivers do not cover amendment. So under current procedure, amendments cutting spending may be considered, but amendments increasing spending violate the Budget Act requirement for a final budget resolution before new spending may be considered.

However, if this resolution is adopted, there will be no prohibition under the Budget Act remaining against amendments which increase spending. This may result in moving the House toward larger deficits rather than reducing deficits. Even if the House should manage to hold the line against spending increase amendments, the fact remains that many of the so-called savings in the original House-passed budget resolution are suspect at best.

To lock the House into this position would be to run up the white flag on achieving more meaningful, real savings in its ongoing negotiations with the other body.

Mr. Speaker, to adopt this resolution now removes much of the incentive to reach a budget agreement with the other body. We should be trying to encourage agreement, rather than making it easier to get along without any final budget resolution.

Mr. Speaker, a vote for this resolution is a vote for more, not less, spending and I oppose the resolution and ask my colleagues to join me in defeating it.

As one of the conferees on the budget, let me finish my remarks by setting forth some of the differences between the House and the Senate on these issues.

As the figures will indicate, the House must come up with some hard cuts, and reconciliation instructions which will produce results. These are several areas of disagreement on real cuts. We have to get back to the negotiating table with the other body, make these real savings, get away from any puffery, and there has been some admission that there were some, on both sides—not only on this side in

the Democrat budget, but in the other body, and get this budget resolution in place.

I have heard many speeches this year and in past years about how important it is to have a budget resolution, and I believe it is important to have a budget resolution. But the only way to get a budget resolution is to get concurrence with the other body and to come to some agreement on the differences. I think the time is short for getting an agreement.

We have to lay aside some of the differences, think only about the future if we do not come to some resolution of this problem.

Let me first ask this question of the Members of this House: Without a budget resolution, are you prepared, as early perhaps as the first of October, to be voting on an increase in the debt ceiling to as high as \$2 trillion—\$2 trillion? That is the forecast from the Treasury Department.

I think time is late for action, and this problem deserves action. We have to be prepared in the House to make cuts in our favorite programs, and we hear about them all the time. You cannot say you cannot cut this or that, but for gosh sakes, reduce the deficit. We have to reduce the deficit, and the only way to do it is in those programs that are your pet programs.

□ 1050

No one has said during this conference that we ought to be touching the so-called poverty programs or the needs-tested programs. We have laid those aside. We have laid COLA's aside. We have taken half the cuts out of defense in the House-passed budget, and defense only represents a third of the total budget. So for any Member to come down in the well and attempt to argue, as we have heard the last few days, that we have got to take more out of defense shows a lack of knowledge of what has already been accomplished. We have got to start touching those programs which are sensitive to the Members of the House.

The time to act is now, but not the way we are proceeding here this morning by passing a resolution to waive the Budget Act on all of the appropriations bills.

I raised this question yesterday before the Rules Committee: What would be the scenario if we come back with a budget resolution and we had passed appropriations above what is called for in that budget resolution? Nobody came up with the answer. Are we going to have to repass them? Are we going to have to lay them aside? What are we going to do? Nobody seemed to have the answer.

But we are about to pass a general waiver of the Budget Act. I think if we have to have a waiver on these appropriation bills, we ought to be taking

them up one at a time, not doing it with one sweep.

Mr. Speaker, I include with my remarks a table showing the differences between the House and Senate budget figures, as follows:

HOUSE OFFER VERSUS SENATE BUDGET: MAJOR DOMESTIC CATEGORIES

Program	Senate savings in excess of House		House offer (Senate savings)	
	1986	1986-88	1986	1986-88
Hard program savings:				
1 COLA's:				
2 Social Security COLA.....	6.0	22.0	0	0
3 Other COLA's.....	1.7	6.3	0	0
4 Subtotal.....	7.7	28.3	0	0
Hard program savings: Non-COLA's:				
5 Civilian/military retirement.....	5	5.9	0	5
6 Medicaid.....	3	1.2	0	0
7 Child nutrition.....	4	1.4	0	0
8 WIN/CSA.....	3	1.7	0	0
9 Food stamps.....	3	1.0	0	0
10 Training/health grants.....	3	2.0	0	0
11 Student aid.....	1	5	0	0
12 Other poverty programs.....	1	6	0	0
13 Medicare.....	1	2.9	0	1.4
14 Exim direct loans.....	2	2.2	1	8
15 SPRO.....	5	1.9	2	6
16 Postal subsidy.....	7	2.2	2	9
17 Highway programs.....	1.4	1	1	1
18 Amtrak.....	3	3	0	0
19 Veterans health care.....	1	1.2	0	0
20 GSI.....	0.2	9	1	7
21 Veterans housing.....	2	7	0	0
22 EDA, ARC, UDAG/HODAG.....	1	1.0	1	1.1
23 SBA.....	2	1.3	2	7
24 Job Corps.....	3	0	0	0
25 Mass transit.....	2	1.45	1	6
26 Sec. 108.....	2	2	2	2
27 CDBG.....	0	0	0	5
28 Rural housing.....	8	3.2	0	0
29 Subtotal.....	5.6	35.6	1.0	8.3
30 Grand total, hard savings.....	13.3	63.8	1.0	8.3
Soft savings and bookkeeping				
31 Farm programs.....	1.4	4.8	3	2.0
32 Superfund.....	3	1.9	3	3
33 Public housing debt forgiveness.....	1.6	4.7	1.6	4.7
34 Public housing finance reform.....	5	2.2	5	2.2
35 FEHB reserves.....	2	1	5	8
36 4 percent non-DOD work force cut.....	5	2.0	5	2.0
37 Administrative cut.....	6	1.9	6	1.9
38 Rural housing asset sale.....	0	0	6	2.7
39 Unspecified transportation savings.....	0	0	3	1.6
40 Unspecified function 500.....	0	0	1	5
41 Law enforcement freeze.....	0	0	1	4
42 Subtotal.....	4.7	17.6	5.1	19.1
43 Grand total, domestic in Senate.....	18.0	81.4	6.1	27.4
New House proposals:				
44 Nuclear electric user fee.....	0	0	3	1.1
45 Higher grazing fees.....	0	0	1	2
46 State and local new hires (SS).....	0	0.0	2	2.0
47 Eliminate PILT.....	0	0	1	3
48 Mineral lease revenue sharing.....	0	0	1.6	1.8
49 Subtotal.....	0	0	1.3	5.4
Bridge to House offer as reported:				
50 Hard program savings.....		1.0		8.3
51 Soft savings/bookkeeping.....		5.1		19.1
52 New House proposals.....		1.3		5.4
53 Drop 1986 revenue sharing.....		-9		-1.2
54 Other small items.....		-2		-5
55 Gross House offer.....		6.3		30.1
56 Drop contracting out.....		-3.9		-12.3
57 Debt service adjustment.....		-1.7		-5.1
58 Net House offer.....		7		12.7

Mr. DERRICK. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished chairman of the Budget Committee, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GRAY].

Mr. GRAY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the proposed rule to implement the House-passed budget resolution.

Although I am still working to reach agreement with the Senate conferees on a budget resolution for fiscal year 1986, I believe that the House must take immediate steps to implement its own budget. The House is firmly committed to a budget-reduction figure of \$56 billion in deficit reductions this year, and this message can never be delivered too strongly to the other body or to the American people.

What is being asked here is not a waiver of the Budget Act but a strong enforcement of the Budget Act. The House has made some tough decisions. We have made real cuts, and in our last offer to the Senate we offered \$24 billion in additional cuts. Yet our offer was rejected.

This weekend we have heard four different targets coming from the other body and from the White House. We heard \$28 billion, we heard \$50 billion, we heard \$70 billion, and we have heard \$80 billion.

While the other body and the White House are trying to come together and get a target, we have to continue with the orderly business of this Nation. That means bringing forth the appropriation bills in order to meet our deadline at the end of this fiscal year. All this resolution does is simply allow us to continue that orderly business, allow the appropriation bills to come forward, and also let the Members of this House on both sides of the aisle know that those appropriation bills are under the House-passed budget. Thus, there is a 302(b) allocation that is published, as well as 302(a) allocation.

So in essence we are not waiving the Budget Act. We are simply saying that we need to move judiciously and efficiently in the House legislatively, and what we are doing is establishing a mechanism to do that in light of the fact that we do not have a conference report. As soon as we have a conference report, it will supersede the House-passed budget, but until then this mechanism will allow us to proceed with appropriation bills and have published in the RECORD 302(a)'s and 302(b)'s so that Members will know that each of the appropriation bills is under the House-passed budget.

It is important for us to do this for two reasons. First, let us remember that last year, because the other body had another problem, we did not get a conference report until October. Thus we had to pass several appropriation bills, and often Members asked, "Can

we tell for sure that these bills are under the House-passed resolution?" The answer was, "No, you cannot tell for sure because we don't have a published 302(b) allocation."

Second, I would also remind the Members that last year, besides not getting a conference report until October, often Members were put into the position of voting for appropriation bills, and then those very same votes were used against them to imply that they broke the budget every time they voted for an appropriation bill. By voting for this House resolution, all you are saying on both sides of the aisle is that this is the budget until we have a conference report, and thus we will have a published report and know exactly where each of these appropriation bills stands in relation to the House-passed budget which was bipartisanly passed this spring.

So I would urge my colleagues to recognize that this is not waiving the Budget Act. This is enforcing the Budget Act. This is showing once again that we in the House are committed to achieving over \$50 billion of deficit reductions, and if we get a conference report, we will work to implement that as well. And this chairman stands ready to go back to the conference table with the Senate as soon as they convene. But again I remind the Members that the targets keep moving.

Mr. LATTI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. LOTT].

Mr. LOTT. Mr. Speaker, I fear that this procedure that we are about to vote on is one more nail in the coffin of the budget process. I really hate to see that because I think that the budget process that we set up under the Budget Impoundment Act is a good idea and one that I would like to see work. It has not worked very well in restraining spending, but I would like to see us keep working at trying to make it a success.

□ 1100

Now, as far as the argument that these appropriation bills are under the House-passed budget resolution, so is the sky. I mean, there is no restraint, in my opinion under the House budget resolution, so it is not very impressive when you are told that it is under the House budget resolution.

There are a lot of angles to this budget that I would like my colleagues to consider and I will just mentioned a few of them.

I remember, though, Mr. Speaker, President Lincoln used to pose the riddle, "If you call a tail a leg, how many legs does a horse have?" And when the answer would inevitably come back, "five legs," Lincoln would

respond: "No. A horse would still have four legs. Calling a tail a leg doesn't make it a leg."

I would suggest to my colleagues that this resolution suffers from the same problem. It tries to call the House-passed budget resolution the "congressional budget." But calling it so doesn't make it so. We're just horsing around with this gimmick—pulling everyone's leg, and spinning tales. And why are we going to all this trouble? Mainly so we don't have to waive the Budget Act every time an appropriations bill comes to the floor. This resolution provides a blanket waiver of the Budget Act—one, big horse blanket.

Mr. Speaker, my majority party colleagues on the Rules Committee, in collaboration with the majority leadership, have presented us with a convenient little procedure that will spare us waiving the Budget Act piecemeal as we take up spending bills. Moreover, they will argue that by adopting this resolution we are somehow preserving orderly process, and especially the budget process and the discipline that goes with it.

Unfortunately, all those representations are just plain false. This does not preserve the congressional budget process; it gives formal recognition to a new House budget process. It says, "the other body be damned; full speed ahead." You will note that this is not a concurrent resolution on budget procedures; it is a simple House resolution.

Does this preserve the discipline of the budget process? Yes and no. This will trigger the reconciliation process. Our committees that are subject to reconciliation instructions will have to report their bills within 30 calendar days. This will also kick in the overall spending limit on October 1.

But, on the other hand, this resolution will also permit amendments to be offered to appropriations bills to increase spending—something that cannot be done under existing procedures without a specific waiver of the Budget Act against amendments. So consider the fact that during this crucial stage of the appropriations process, you will be authorizing spending increase amendments by adopting this resolution.

Also consider the fact that by adopting this resolution you will be taking the pressure off the conferees to work out a final budget resolution. Why should they? This gives them everything the House voted for.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, let me caution my colleagues to think before you vote. Think about what this resolution really does. Think about the precedent you are setting in converting the congressional budget process into a House budget process. Think about the harm you are doing to bi-

cameralism and budgetary compromise by calling the House budget a congressional budget. Think about the damage you are doing to the prospect of achieving real savings in the area of \$50 billion if you threaten a House-Senate compromise on a savings package and settle for the limited savings in the House-passed resolution that the other body might agree to.

I would submit that when you get done thinking about these larger issues, you just might be willing to join with me and set aside the temporary comfort and convenience this resolution might offer, and stick with existing procedures. We already have a budget process. Let's make it work. Defeat this resolution.

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's statement.

Assuming that the gentleman is concerned about the deficit, jobs in Mississippi and jobs in America, I make that critical assumption.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. LOTT] has expired.

Mr. LATTI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 additional minute to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman and I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

If that is true, the deficit being critical, how would the gentleman reduce the deficit? The gentleman is not for Social Security cuts, he is not for any cuts in defense, he is not for any new taxes. I just ask the gentleman, as a responsible legislator with whom I share much in common and of whom I have a high regard, it seems to me that our colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, is trying to put a budget on the House floor. What might we do constructively to help that?

Mr. LOTT. Well, Mr. Speaker, I would like to answer that question.

First of all, under the agreements that have been tentatively reached, I think we have already agreed to defense spending reductions in excess of \$22 billion, and where we make those savings are in nondefense discretionary domestic appropriated accounts across the board, freeze them across the board. There are a lot of them that could be eliminated or cut further.

But the gentleman from Pennsylvania is trying to move in that direction and I think the conferees can make progress; but let us not take the pressure off them to make that progress by passing this resolution.

Mr. GRAY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GRAY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I would say to the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi, with regard to taking pressure off the conference, in fact this does just the opposite. It puts pressure on the conferees.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. LOTT] has again expired.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 additional minute to the gentleman.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GRAY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I would say to the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi that just the opposite is true. Today there are reports in the media that the Senate is talking about not operating with a budget at all in 1986. The other body is talking about no budget.

Mr. LOTT. Well, Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will allow me to respond to that particular point, that information is not correct. My colleagues in the other body are going to work further with the gentleman from Pennsylvania and make progress.

Mr. GRAY of Pennsylvania. Well, I hope that is true, but it seems to me that what we are doing in this simple resolution is putting in place a mechanism so that we can show clearly that we are prepared to enforce the savings in the House budget until such time as we get a conference report.

I want the gentleman to know that I want to keep the pressure on. I think this is the mechanism to keep the pressure on, because it says that the House is going to achieve over \$50 billion worth of savings and the Senate, I am hopeful, will be able to do that, so I would simply say to my colleague that it does not take the pressure off.

Mr. LOTT. Well, what kind of pressure is it when we say, "All right, Appropriations, go ahead and do your deal and we will worry about the budget resolution later?"

Mr. GRAY of Pennsylvania. Well, let me just give the gentleman the answer by going to the opposite. You have to approve individual waivers.

Mr. DERRICK. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FROST].

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, my friend, the gentleman from Mississippi, made a comment a moment ago about another nail in the coffin of the budget process.

I would only point out to my friend, the gentleman from Mississippi, that as a member of the conference committee on this matter, I can tell the gentleman that it is the other body that has broken off the negotiations,

that it is the other body that has proceeded to apply nails to this particular matter, not this body. It is the other body that has refused to come back with another offer at this point.

I hope that they will. I hope the other body will come forward this week, but I do not think that we can point the finger at Members on this side of the aisle or this House for having broken off the negotiations on the budget.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to make several points to my friend, the gentleman from Mississippi.

One. This is a matter of sunshine which Members on both sides of the aisle have sought from time to time, letting everyone know what is happening in the budget process. This resolution would do just that. You would have the 302(a) allocations, the 302(b) allocations, so that Members on that side of the aisle, as well as some Members on our side of the aisle who are concerned about what is happening on these individual appropriation bills would be able to look at those allocations, compare the appropriation bills and make their points during the debate.

Mr. Speaker, I would also point out, as was observed during the debate a moment ago, that this resolution permits reconciliation to go forward and that is very important.

Now, there is some difference of opinion about the amount of reconciliation, whether we should have an "X" figure or a "Y" figure, but the point is that reconciliation, once this resolution is adopted, then could begin, which is very important to enforcing any budget resolution in the House this year.

This is a constructive approach. It permits the House to move forward in a reasonable way to enforce a budget. It is something that should be adopted today.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONTE].

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, last week the Committee on Appropriations reported the fiscal year 1986 appropriation bills, three bills, for Agriculture, Housing and Urban Development, and Treasury-Postal Service.

All we needed at that time to bring these bills to the floor of the House was a waiver of section 303 of the Budget Act for each of the bills and the necessary waivers for lack of authorization.

What we got, instead, was a round trip to political Disney Land, courtesy of the majority leadership. Although the conferees have been unable to agree on a budget resolution for fiscal year 1986, this rule solves that problem by the convenient fiction that Congress "shall be considered to have

adopted" the budget resolution which passed the House.

This has to be the most arrogant imposition on public credibility that I have seen in the last 27 years that I have been in the House, and I hope that the Members of the House will reject this rule here today.

Do we really believe that the public is so gullible that we can simply pass a resolution which says that the Congress has adopted a piece of major legislation, when as a matter of public record we have not? If so, why stop here with the budget resolution, I ask the gentleman from Louisiana?

If we are going to take this ultimate congressional junket to political Disney Land, why not dispose of all of our pending business?

We could legislate by a simple resolution. Think of the possibilities.

We could resolve that the conferees on the first budget resolution for fiscal year 1986 have met and agreed on a budget resolution which provides for a balanced budget through fiscal year 1990, and that this budget resolution has passed the House and the Senate.

We could resolve that the House and the Senate have passed, and the President has signed, a reconciliation bill which makes the changes in entitlement and authorizing legislation needed to implement a balanced budget through 1990.

We could resolve that the House and the Senate have passed, and that the President has signed, all authorizations and appropriation bills outstanding for the fiscal year 1986, which will be consistent with a balanced budget.

We could resolve that the House and Senate have passed, and the President has signed, a tax reform and simplification act, which provides for further reductions in individual tax rates and is revenue neutral and eliminates all unfair tax preferences in the Internal Revenue Code.

□ 1110

We could do that, believe me, if we could do this.

Finally, we could resolve that the first session of the 99th Congress has adjourned until January 3, 1986. What a blessing that would be.

This rule is an insult to the credibility of this House, to the intelligence of our constituents, and we should vote it down.

I see the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLFE] who is interested in doing away with the Synthetic Fuels Corporation, as I am. If you vote for this today and it passes, there is no longer any need for the Interior Committee to go to the Rules Committee to get a rule waiving points of order against

section 302(b) or section 303. And there is no way, I say to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLPE] that I think that you will be able to join me in an amendment zeroing out the Synthetic Fuels Corporation.

Not only him, but the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. SYNAR] and all of the others who oppose the Synthetic Fuels Corporation and want to zero it out.

You are working right into the hands of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MURTHA] and all of the others who favor the Synthetic Fuels Corporation. And I hope that you are listening, I say to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLPE] because there is no way in the world that you are ever going to be able to get rid of the Synthetic Fuels Corporation. We could kill the rule here today and the Interior Committee would not have to come back to the Rules Committee. They can bring the bill right here because they do not need any waivers.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONTE. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, I think the gentleman is confused. We will have to come to the Rules Committee for a rule even though this passes and our Interior rule is voted down. We still will have to come to the Rules Committee for waivers of legislative matters.

We will not have to come to the Rules Committee on the question of waiving the requirements of the Budget Act.

Mr. CONTE. That is optional. That is optional and many, many subcommittee chairmen, I remember the gentleman from Iowa [NEAL SMITH] last year, I think it was, in the State Justice and Commerce bill came here without a rule, and they did raise points of order against those parts of the bill that were not authorized, and they were knocked out.

Mr. YATES. I have considered that possibility. The problem is that several of the legislative committees have not passed bills that will authorize major programs, and we would still have to come to the Rules Committee in order to get a waiver, in order for those very important Departments in Government to keep operating.

Mr. WOLPE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONTE. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. WOLPE. I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I look forward to joining with him in a moment, of course, in the battle against the rule on the Interior appropriation bill.

But first, may I say that I think that the issue just raised with respect to the budget rule before us now, that issue is a red herring. There are many, many other reasons why the Interior

Appropriations Committee or other committees will have come to the Rules Committee beyond the Budget Act, and that is simply a nonissue.

Mr. CONTE. That is a question of judgment by the subcommittee chairman. They have done it many times, they have come here without a rule, and they can do it again.

If you are interested in doing away with the Synthetic Fuels Corporation, you will vote down this rule.

Mr. DERRICK. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield 1 minute and 30 seconds to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SCHUMER].

Mr. SCHUMER. I thank the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. DERRICK] for yielding this time to me.

I must say as to my colleague from Massachusetts, Mr. CONTE, that as a Member of the Appropriations Committee one could expect that he would oppose this resolution. But to my good friend, the gentleman from Ohio and the other Members on the other side of the aisle, I am surprised that they are opposing this resolution, because this resolution once and for all shows that we in the House are serious about the budget, are serious about the deficit and are trying to do something about it.

Can we go all the way as far as the Senate and the White House want us to go on domestic programs? Probably not. But are we trying to go a good part of the way? Yes, we are.

And we are saying we are going to do that whether there is a budget resolution or not. I would remind the gentlemen on that side of the aisle about what has happened in the other body. The other body a very tough budget resolution, and yet in the last week, even though their budget resolution eliminated money for EDA, they put \$30 million in the supplemental appropriation for EDA. Even though the body's Budget Resolution eliminated the money for the ARC, the Appalachian Regional Commission, that body put \$82 million in the appropriation bill, for the ARC.

Even though the other body opposed funding the TVA in their budget resolution, they put \$90 million in their appropriation for that.

If this resolution passes, we cannot do the same thing that is going on in the other body here in the House. We will be proving once and for all that we indeed serious, and we will be making real progress.

I would ask the gentleman from that side of the aisle on the Budget Committee and the others to join us. They should be joining us. They should be saying that this shows the House is serious about the deficit. They should not say white simply because we say black.

Mr. DERRICK. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished chairman of

the Appropriations Committee, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN].

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I hope we will go ahead and pass this rule and get along with our business.

May I say that the Budget Act was not required because of appropriations from our Committee on Appropriations. The Budget Act was recommended by the study of Mr. Ullman of the Ways and Means Committee and myself representing the Appropriations Committee. We recommended the Budget Act because spending was bypassing the annual process by our Committee on Appropriations on 42 percent of Government spending.

What we have here is a resolution where we resolve to carry out what your Appropriations Committee is already doing. We pledged ourselves at the beginning of our action this year, in the absence of a budget resolution, that we would follow the House budget as passed by the House. We have done that and we will continue to do that. The resolution calls on us to do that. Here we would resolve to limit ourselves to the House budget provisions.

May I point out that the budget resolution was due May 15, 70 days ago. If you exclude Mondays and Fridays, we have remaining 13 legislative days. If there is much more delay, justified or otherwise, you are inviting a continuing resolution. We do not ever want that, we have not wanted to legislate by continuing resolution in the past, however it became necessary. This could easily happen again.

I urge you to let us go ahead now. If the Rules Committee wants me up there in the afternoon, in the morning and at midnight, I will be there, because I want the Congress to finish its business. Of course, I would prefer that all waivers be made at once for our convenience. I will point out that we will have about 9,000 witnesses before us this term, and we have had action of various types on appropriation bills in one single day last week. We are ready to work day and night to finish the business of the Congress.

A number of our colleagues wanted us to release the allocations made among the various subcommittees. We have done that. You have it before you and you can look at it. Of course, we reserve the right to reallocate, if such a course should become necessary. I recall a few years ago where we had to take \$1 billion to take care of damages caused at Mount. St. Helens. We may have to do that again on any number of emergencies. But when we have to act, our action will be subject to your approval.

I wish to say again that we have 13 legislative days to wind up this fiscal year and to take care of the future of this Government. Your Committee on

Appropriations has not needed a budget resolution for us to stay in line. We have held the line each year, and will do so this year.

The public has been led to believe that we must have a budget, and if we cannot get one between the two Houses, surely it is appropriate for us to adopt a course as though we had a budget resolution. Our committee will follow the course, for which this resolution provides.

With 13 days remaining, I hope we will adopt this resolution, provide the necessary rules, and proceed.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEMP].

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for yielding. Let me say I can understand why the chairman of the Budget Committee wants to pass this resolution.

But let me rise in opposition for perhaps a different reason. I think it is just very poorly timed. I was disturbed, as I think some Members on the Democratic side of the aisle were, that there are reports from the other body that there are those who do not think that we need a budget.

I certainly think that this is faulty reasoning. We do need a budget and we ought not to give up. We have made, I think, some good-faith offers on both sides of the aisle and on both sides of the Capitol to try to reach a budget compromise.

Let me say to my colleagues in both Chambers, let us not let the process die. There are those who want to give up. And as I said earlier, I can understand why the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Chairman GRAY, wants to pass this resolution in the name of increasing pressure for a budget compromise. But it actually waives the budget in a blanket way, and that would be a mistake in my opinion.

This resolution would suspend the usual 302(b) allocations to the Appropriations Committee, which is one of the most important enforcement mechanisms for deficit reduction. The resolution would be an admission of failure that we cannot achieve a real deficit-reduction package. It suspends the budget process, which is already under attack as toothless.

□ 1120

I give Chairman GRAY credit for making a very good-faith effort to go to the Senate in the conference, on which I serve. I also commend the gentleman from South Carolina. They have offered a compromise. It does not go as far as our side of the aisle wants to go or Members of the Senate. But Chairman GRAY has offered a \$273 billion spending cut package over 3 years and \$56 billion or so in the first year. We ought to give him credit for making an offer which goes further than the House's original budget by

making additional real spending cuts, strengthening reconciliation, and increasing defense budget authority.

Now I would say to some of my colleagues we are going back and attempting to pass today the original House budget which has \$22 billion less saving than the House's second offer. I think that is a mistake. It is poorly timed. Both the House and Senate conferees are trying to achieve a new and better compromise budget package. I definitely want to say, as I previously did, that the chairman has made a good-faith effort. Let the Senate come back and make a new offer. We can then resolve our differences in the next 48 hours, which I am optimistic we can do, if we set aside some of our pseudodifferences and get down to numbers.

Chairman DOMENICI has set a budget savings benchmark that is very positive with regard to reducing the deficit. It is a bold package. Perhaps our Democratic friends cannot go that far. There are some of us in the House in the Republican Party that cannot go that far on certain items.

But I think we can find a way to work together to increase domestic savings without hurting the defense of the country and improving, as I think the chairman would like to do, the process for reconciliation or budget enforcement, as he and the gentleman from South Carolina have offered.

A good place to start in looking for additional savings might be to abolish or dramatically reduce synthetic fuels subsidies to major oil companies for producing synthetic fuels. We might think in terms of reducing subsidies for the Eximbank which subsidizes corporations for trading or exporting to other countries. We might reduce substantially outdated so-called economic development agencies. Those reforms would save \$5 billion over 3 years. We might want to consider giving Amtrak's Northeast corridor routes to its employees for long-term savings and pass a moratorium on the strategic petroleum reserve [SPR] for additional savings of a couple of billion dollars.

We could abolish the Direct Loan Program of the SBA as recommended by the National Federation of Independent Businessmen, for another billion.

There are \$3 billion to \$5 billion that could easily be saved in other business subsidy programs beyond those I mentioned. I am not outlining a plan; I am not outlining the things that absolutely must be done. But we ought to go back in conference and not let the process die. In my opinion, we are about \$5 to \$7 billion apart in fiscal year 1986 and about \$20 billion apart over the 3 years.

Now, do not forget, my friends, we are talking about almost a \$1 trillion budget in a \$4 trillion-plus GNP and

we have narrowed our differences to around \$7 billion to \$8 billion.

Mr. Speaker, this is a huge economy. We have narrowed our differences. The chairman and the gentleman from South Carolina have made a good-faith effort to resolve some of the differences on reconciliation and enforcement. More could be done, more cuts could be made, some of which I have outlined.

I really think that the differences between the House and the Senate budget are not irreconcilable. They can be broached. The outlines for agreement are in sight. We ought to get moving.

On that basis, I would ask my colleagues on both sides of the Capitol to reconsider their support for the budget process. Let us get the conferees back and make the effort that has to be made, not on behalf of either side of the Capitol Hill or either party but on behalf of the American economy, getting those deficits down and getting a good budget for fiscal year 1986.

Mr. DERRICK. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MacKAY].

Mr. MacKAY. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I speak for a group on this side of the aisle which last week objected to waiving the Budget Act, for two very specific reasons. One, we felt that the waiver would force us to give up the right to insist on reconciliation, a discipline required by the Budget Act. Two, we were unwilling to waive our right under the Budget Act to insist on 302(b) allocations. Without these allocations, which set upper limits on spending for each program, there is no way for individual Members to understand the entire spending proposal being put forward by the Appropriations Committee.

Today's resolution assures us that both of these rights will be protected.

Now clearly there is going to be a continuing resolution. This is going to happen whether we waive the Budget Act or whether we do not waive the Budget Act, and that is going to be because we have stalled around and played games far beyond the time contemplated to go forward with the budget resolution.

I do not know whose fault that is. I think there is enough fault so that we can all take our share of the blame for the position we find ourselves in. But the question of what happens on the continuing resolution is an issue not to be decided today. That is the issue to be decided when we have a rule, this year I hope, that says we will have the same limitations on the continuing resolution that we have on general appropriations bills. If that rule had been in effect last year, we could have avoided the farce which took place at

the end of the session, when the continuing resolution negated all efforts to achieve fiscal discipline.

In the meantime, I believe we are preserving the discipline of the Budget Act, we are doing as much as we can do under the circumstances, not as people who get together under the oak tree on the lawn of the White House and decide the future of the world, but as general, ordinary Members of the House who say, "I want to force the system to work the way it is supposed to work." We are doing all we can do. I think there was a major concession made by the Appropriations Committee. We can go home to our constituents in August and say, "The budget process is not working right, but at least I can tell you now in advance what is going to happen so far as the House spending decisions are concerned." That is not a spectacular gain, but it is probably all we can achieve under the constraints of the White House agreement.

Mr. Speaker, I urge support of this resolution.

Mr. DERRICK. For purposes of debate only, Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California [Mrs. BOXER].

Mrs. BOXER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, this past weekend I held community meetings throughout my district. People asked me "Congresswoman, what happened to the budget?" I told them, "I believe politics was getting in the way of a joint House/Senate budget and that that is unfortunate."

Today by passing this resolution I think we can rise above politics and show America that we are breaking the logjam, that we are moving ahead with the \$56 billion deficit reduction this House already passed by such a wide margin.

Let the other body squabble, but let us move forward with deficit reduction. Let the other body walk out of conference, but let us move forward with deficit reduction. Let the other body work without a budget, but let us move forward with a budget.

Now I wish the other body would change, but we in the House cannot control that. But we can control what we do.

So let us move forward today with this resolution, with deficit reductions. Let us pass this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER].

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I certainly agree with the chairman of the Committee on the Budget when he said that we are not waiving the Budget Act here. That is

right. What we are doing is abandoning the Budget Act. What we have decided to do with this particular resolution is that we have decided that the process to which we have committed ourselves in the past does not work and so therefore we have learned to come up with a whole new process. This is another case of when you cannot live with the rules that you have set, you simply abandon the rules midstream.

That is what we are doing here. When it comes to spending money, I think there is no barrier that this House will not abandon in order to spend the money. This bill is called a sunshine bill here. That is right. I would agree it is a sunshine bill. There is nothing under the Sun we will not do in order to spend money. This Congress has regularly overspent its own budget. Over the last 5 years, we have overspent our own budgets to the tune of \$150 billion or more. This is how we do it. This is exactly the kind of bill, the kind of approach that we use in order to overspend our own budgets.

□ 1130

Vote for this resolution if that is what you are going to do; that is fine, but you are voting for more spending and you are voting to abandon the budget process.

Mr. DERRICK. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO].

Mr. FAZIO. Mr. Speaker, we are conducting another one of those arcane debates some of us refer to as "inside baseball" around here. People out across the country expect two things of us in the context of our budget process.

One, they want us to cut spending; they want us to balance the budget; they want us to reduce spending; they want us to move at least in the direction of reduction in our annual deficit so that we get back to the historic level we began with in 1980 when President Reagan took office, and secondly, they want us to keep the process of government functioning; they do not want us to run up against that October 1 fiscal year deadline and have to close down the Federal Establishment for symbolic purposes.

I argue that this resolution today allows us to move forward on both of those issues. First of all, it does not in any way reduce the pressure on our budget conferees. As a conferee myself, I can tell you that we feel the pressure. It is the kind of pressure that results from out of the knowledge we have about the strength of "the bully pulpit," the Presidency, President Reagan's ability to stand up and cast aspersions against the Congress as his top aide, Mr. Regan did the other morning, for failing in our responsibilities to enact deficit reduction measures.

We know that however ineffective some of us may consider the budget process, it is the most important symbolic act we can engage in, and we will continue our efforts in the conference this week, next week and when we come back, if must be the case, in September to pass a resolution so that we can enact the proper framework to meet our needs.

We are also, I think, able to say that the Appropriations Committee historically has met its targets. Senator HARTFIELD, the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, a leading Republican, said in the debate on the Senate floor on the line-item veto yesterday that we have come \$12 to \$13 billion below President Reagan's spending requests since he has been in office; and right now the 10 appropriations bills that have come at least to full committee are \$7.5 billion below the budget authority granted to them in the 302(b) tentative allocation. This committee is not the problem.

This is the approach we need to impose discipline on ourselves; the Senate needs it as well; I hope we can proceed at least today to give confidence to our budget process and to the Appropriations Committee's proper approach as well.

Mr. DERRICK. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MORRISON].

Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding and I rise in support of the resolution.

This is a resolution that gives us the tools to at least live within spending limits. It gives us the tools to control and reduce spending. Those who are attacking this resolution as an attack on the budget process really do not want to come to grips with the fact that we want something real to compare the appropriations measures to.

This resolution gives us 302(b) guidelines by which we can judge the appropriations as they come to the floor. It gives us the beginning of a reconciliation process where we can save billions of dollars in spending if we will move forward in that process.

It gives us a 302(a) limit which can limit any continuing resolution that will be coming before this House.

We can and should do more than just pass this resolution, but it is a beginning; it is a beginning that gets the House of Representatives on record in its rules that will live at least within the budget that we have already passed, and the other body, if it has more savings, can get to give or more savings to ask, can certainly amend what we pass in the appropriation and reconciliation process to implement those greater savings.

Mr. DERRICK. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield 1

minute to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. LEVIN].

Mr. LEVIN of Michigan. I appreciate the gentleman yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the resolution. I have listened to some of the debate, and I am somewhat surprised by the statement from the other side. What this resolution says is that we will meet the other house halfway on a resolution, but in the meanwhile, the House, this House is going to put our own house in order.

It has been said that this resolution would diminish the pressure on the other house. I think it will increase the pressure. It will show that we here are able to act within a framework that brings about major savings.

So for all of those reasons, I hope very much that we will vote for the resolution. This is a very significant first step toward the kind of budget that this country needs.

Mr. DERRICK. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. ROEMER].

Mr. ROEMER. I thank my colleague for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, this is a close call today. This is not an easy vote for a lot of people who care deeply about what we have done to this country in terms of the deficit. This is a close call today for those who are worried about jobs and get letters like I do about tomorrow and what it holds.

I did not support the budget that passed the House a couple weeks ago, and as a result it is very difficult for me to vote to put into effect the very budget that I voted against.

This is a close call, and I do not mean to cast stones in either direction, but I have decided that I cannot vote for this rule. I do so reluctantly; I do so without any animosity toward anyone. I just think the basic question is: Are we better off to put a bad budget in place or have no budget at all momentarily? Right now, I like the pressure of the individual votes on the appropriations bills. Because I voted against this budget, I am not going to be able to vote to impose it. That support is the responsibility of those who supported this budget originally. I did not. I can not.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BOULTER].

Mr. BOULTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for yielding and I rise in opposition to the resolution, for a number of reasons that have already been expressed.

Mr. Speaker, it would, as the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. ROEMER] said, put into effect what many of us consider to be a very bad budget; a budget which as I recall in the area of nondefense domestic cuts actually contains \$13 billion above a freeze level.

I rise in opposition to the resolution because it is a vote for that very budget. What we are doing today would remove pressure on House budget conferees to get a budget; those of us who think it is important to have a budget should vote against this. There is no precedent for it; it erodes the budget process, and it would actually permit spending increase amendments to be offered to appropriations bills.

I hope that this vote today will be viewed as the big spending vote of this Congress, because I believe this vote is a budget-buster, and it is an abandonment of the budget process.

Mr. DERRICK. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SLATTERY].

Mr. SLATTERY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. DERRICK] for yielding, and I rise in somewhat reluctant support of the resolution.

The reason I do, Mr. Speaker, is because frankly the bottom line is, this is as good as we are going to do at this point. The fact of the matter is that we have made a good faith offer to the other body; \$56 billion in deficit reduction next year; \$273 billion over the next 3 years; and the Senate has in effect walked away from that offer.

At this point, we do not know whether the Senate is going to continue to participate in the conference or not. That leaves us in the position where we are totally at the mercy of the Senate.

I do not believe we can leave ourselves in that position, Mr. Speaker, and it seems we have no other choice. At least with this resolution we will be in a position to judge the appropriation bills against the earlier passed House budget resolution; and in addition to that, there is nothing in this resolution—and I say this to my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, and also to my colleagues on the Democratic side of the aisle—there is nothing in this resolution that will prevent individual Members from having the opportunity to come to this mike in the well of this House and offer amendments to further trim the appropriation bill that might be coming forward.

I, for one, intend to do that, and I would urge my other colleagues who are really interested in deficit reduction, to join me in that effort.

Mr. DERRICK. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. PANETTA].

□ 1140

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Speaker, the issue here today is whether there will be any semblance of discipline whatsoever in the House with regard to the budget resolution. That is the issue. I

regret as much as anyone else the fact that we do not have an agreement on a conference report regarding the budget resolution. There is plenty of blame for that to go around for everybody. But the blame will be on this House if we at the very least do not have the guts to support the very resolution that was adopted here. That is the point of this resolution. It is to provide some semblance of enforcement, scorekeeping on the appropriations bills. What could be the problem of providing a list of scorekeeping so we know whether in fact appropriation bills meet what is in the resolution? It provides for reconciliation. Reconciliation is the only tool we have in the budget process. This will allow reconciliation to go forward so that at the very least we can achieve those savings here.

Now, I understand the argument that some do not like the particular resolution. You may not like the shape of the barn; but it is no reason to leave the barn door open. This resolution tries to close that door. And at the very least, it is the minimal step that needs to be taken if we are to say to the American people, "We exercised some discipline on the budget process." This is your chance.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MACK].

Mr. MACK. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I rise in opposition to the rule. I think that to continue to make the statement about discipline and to make statements about one of the ways to avoid a continuing resolution is to vote for this rule is just totally misleading. The same comments were made last year. We ended up with a continuing resolution last year that increased spending by 13 percent.

What good is it to have scorekeeping if the scorekeeping is going to indicate to us that we are going to raise spending 13 percent?

So I think we are headed in the wrong direction. If we want discipline, we ought to make ourselves live within the Budget Act.

If I could, I would like to ask one question of the chairman of the Budget Committee.

What has happened to the \$4 billion in contracting out. Is the Appropriation Committee going to deal with contracting out?

Mr. GRAY of Pennsylvania. The \$4 billion in contracting out has been assigned to the Appropriations Committee. It is in the 302 allocation and it is in the 302(b)'s.

Mr. MACK. I thank the gentleman for the information.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. LATTI] is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. LATTI. Mr. Speaker, let me say that anybody who believes that the passage of this resolution is going to speed up the conference and the passage of a joint resolution on the budget must have to believe in the tooth fairy. They are living in dreamland. This makes it easier for the whole thing to go by the board.

I pointed out in my general remarks earlier something that seems to have escaped the people who want to do something about reducing expenditures. There is a difference in what they are doing here and what we would do otherwise. This is actually a matter of convenience. This is not only a blanket waiver of section 303(a) of the Budget Act, which requires a budget resolution to be in place before appropriation bills can be considered, but it actually would permit spending increase amendments to be offered to appropriation bills.

Under current procedure, even the House may waive section 303(a) against individual appropriation bills. Such waivers do not cover amendments which provide additional budget authority or spending increase amendments. Therefore, the adoption of this resolution can be interpreted as authorizing budget busting amendments that are currently prohibited under existing law.

So anybody who believes that we are going to reduce spending by passing a resolution that most of us on this side did not support in the first place, which had peanuts for reconciliation, which had a lot of puffery in it, escapes my imagination.

I think the only way to do anything about the deficit is to get back in conference and cut, cut, cut expenditures. Quit beating around the bush about it. Let us do something about it. And the way to do it is back in conference and not passing waivers like this. You can call it anything you like, but it is a waiver of the Budget Act and it opens the door for the Appropriations Committee to come in here on all of these appropriations with a blanket waiver of the Budget Act without coming up to the Rules Committee with a justification for a waiver on every bill.

I think they ought to come in and make their case on each individual appropriation bill.

Mr. DERRICK. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1½ minutes.

Mr. Speaker, to have not voted for the budget resolution last time is no excuse for not voting for this resolution. That is an untenable excuse. The House passed the budget resolution. This is an opportunity for the House to say to the American people who are looking to this Congress for some sort of fiscal discipline that we, even though we have made every effort

that we possibly can to come to an agreement with the Senate on a budget resolution, that having failed that, until we do that—and I believe we will come to an agreement in very short order—that we are going to have what it takes to discipline ourselves.

There is no other way that the reconciliation process and the budget enforcement process of the House may go into effect without supporting this resolution.

So I suggest to the Members that those who are not voting for this because they do not like the budget are being very shortsighted. I voted for the budget. There is a lot in there I do not like. But what I do like and what I do demand, and what I do think we owe the American people is to tell them that, yes, the U.S. House of Representatives has what it takes to discipline itself.

Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GRAY].

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GRAY] is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. GRAY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker and colleagues, there really are only two questions to be answered in this vote, and that is: Do you want to enforce what you voted bipartisanly, overwhelmingly for, just a couple of months ago in stating what the House priorities were? Do you want to demonstrate to America and to the other body that you are prepared to discipline yourself, enforce over \$50 billion worth of savings? Or are we going to continue to play partisan politics and allow the red ink to swell up around us?

The Appropriations Committee, led by the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi, has already pledged itself to be a part of that great effort. That is the first question. So if you voted for the budget a couple of months ago, you ought to vote for this resolution.

Second, let me just say: Is this budget that we have from the House in conference the best budget in the world? I would say it is not. Given the constraints of the House policy, in terms of COLA's, given the constraints of the President's position on revenues, I believe it is a good start toward cutting spending. So let us enforce it; let us pass this resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time has expired.

Mr. DERRICK. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. LATTI. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum

is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 242, nays 184, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 251]

YEAS—242

Ackerman	Gaydos	Olin
Addabbo	Gejdenson	Ortiz
Akaka	Gephardt	Owens
Alexander	Gibbons	Panetta
Anderson	Glickman	Pease
Andrews	Gonzalez	Penny
Annunzio	Gordon	Pepper
Anthony	Gray (IL)	Perkins
Aspin	Gray (PA)	Pickle
Atkins	Guarini	Price
AuCoin	Hall (OH)	Rahall
Barnard	Hall, Ralph	Rangel
Barnes	Hamilton	Ray
Bates	Hatcher	Reid
Bedell	Hawkins	Richardson
Bellenson	Hayes	Robinson
Bennett	Heftel	Rodino
Berman	Hertel	Roe
Bevill	Howard	Rose
Biaggi	Hoyer	Rostenkowski
Boggs	Hubbard	Rowland (GA)
Boland	Huckaby	Roybal
Boner (TN)	Hughes	Russo
Bonior (MI)	Hutto	Sabo
Bonker	Jacobs	Savage
Borski	Jenkins	Scheuer
Bosco	Jones (NC)	Schroeder
Boucher	Jones (OK)	Schumer
Boxer	Jones (TN)	Seiberling
Brooks	Kanjorski	Sharp
Brown (CA)	Kaptur	Shelby
Bruce	Kastenmeier	Sikorski
Bryant	Kennelly	Sisisky
Burton (CA)	Kildee	Skelton
Bustamante	Klecza	Slattery
Byron	Kolter	Smith (FL)
Carper	Kostmayer	Smith (IA)
Carr	LaFalce	Solarz
Chappell	Lantos	Spratt
Clay	Leath (TX)	St Germain
Coelho	Lehman (CA)	Staggers
Coleman (TX)	Lehman (FL)	Stallings
Collins	Leland	Stark
Cooper	Levin (MI)	Stenholm
Coyne	Levine (CA)	Stokes
Crockett	Lipinski	Stratton
Daniel	Lloyd	Studds
Darden	Long	Swift
Daschle	Lowry (WA)	Synar
de la Garza	Luken	Tallon
Dellums	Lundine	Tauzin
Derrick	MacKay	Taylor
Dicks	Manton	Thomas (GA)
Dingell	Markey	Torres
Dixon	Martinez	Torricelli
Donnelly	Matsui	Towns
Dorgan (ND)	Mavroules	Trafficant
Dowdy	McCloskey	Traxler
Durbin	McCurdy	Udall
Dwyer	McHugh	Valentine
Dymally	Mica	Vento
Dyson	Mikulski	Visclosky
Eckart (OH)	Miller (CA)	Volkmer
Edgar	Mineta	Walgren
Edwards (CA)	Mitchell	Watkins
English	Moakley	Waxman
Erdreich	Mollohan	Weaver
Evans (IL)	Montgomery	Weiss
Fascell	Moody	Wheat
Fazio	Morrison (CT)	Whitley
Feighan	Mrazek	Whitten
Filippo	Murphy	Williams
Florio	Murtha	Wilson
Foglietta	Natcher	Wirth
Foley	Neal	Wise
Ford (TN)	Nelson	Wolpe
Fowler	Nichols	Wyden
Frank	Nowak	Yates
Frost	Oakar	Yatron
Fuqua	Oberstar	Young (MO)
Garcia	Obey	

NAYS—184

Applegate	Gradison	Oxley
Archer	Green	Packard
Armey	Gregg	Parris
Badham	Grothberg	Pashayan
Bartlett	Gunderson	Petri
Barton	Hammerschmidt	Porter
Bateman	Hansen	Pursell
Bentley	Hartnett	Quillen
Bereuter	Hendon	Regula
Bilirakis	Henry	Ridge
Billiey	Hiler	Rinaldo
Boehlert	Hillis	Ritter
Boulter	Holt	Roberts
Breaux	Hopkins	Roemer
Broomfield	Horton	Rogers
Brown (CO)	Hunter	Roth
Broyhill	Hyde	Roukema
Burton (IN)	Ireland	Rowland (CT)
Callahan	Jeffords	Rudd
Campbell	Johnson	Saxton
Carney	Kasich	Schaefer
Chandler	Kemp	Schneider
Chappie	Kindness	Schuetz
Cheney	Kolbe	Schulze
Clinger	Kramer	Sensenbrenner
Coats	Lagomarsino	Shaw
Cobey	Latta	Shumway
Coble	Leach (IA)	Shuster
Coleman (MO)	Lent	Siljander
Combest	Lewis (CA)	Skeen
Conte	Lewis (FL)	Slaughter
Conyers	Lightfoot	Smith (NE)
Coughlin	Livingston	Smith (NH)
Courter	Loeffler	Smith (NJ)
Craig	Lott	Smith, Denny
Crane	Lowery (CA)	Smith, Robert
Dannemeyer	Lungren	Snowe
Daub	Mack	Snyder
Davis	Madigan	Solomon
DeLay	Marlenee	Spence
DeWine	Martin (IL)	Stangeland
Dickinson	Martin (NY)	Strang
DioGuardi	Mazzoli	Stump
Dornan (CA)	McCain	Sundquist
Dreier	McCandless	Sweeney
Duncan	McCollum	Swindall
Early	McDade	Tauke
Eckert (NY)	McEwen	Thomas (CA)
Edwards (OK)	McGrath	Vander Jagt
Emerson	McKernan	Vucanovich
Evans (IA)	McKinney	Walker
Fawell	McMillan	Weber
Fiedler	Meyers	Whitehurst
Fields	Miller (OH)	Whittaker
Fish	Miller (WA)	Wolf
Franklin	Mollinari	Wortley
Frenzel	Moore	Wylie
Gallo	Moorhead	Young (AK)
Gekas	Morrison (WA)	Young (FL)
Gilman	Myers	Zschau
Gingrich	Nielson	
Goodling	O'Brien	

NOT VOTING—7

Downey	Lujan	Wright
Ford (MI)	Michel	
Hefner	Monson	

□ 1200

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Wright for, with Mr. Michel against.
Mr. Ford of Michigan for, with Mr. Monson against.

So the resolution was agreed to.
The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 1210

THE BATTLE HYMN OF THE REPUBLICANS

(Mr. CONTE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, unfortunately, I am not permitted to sing on the House floor. But, on this historic occasion, I would like to recite "The Battle Hymn of the Republicans":

Mine eyes have seen the glory of the victorious G.O.P.

We trampled down those Democrats by a score of 9 to 3.

At 17-6-1, you call this a rivalry?

The G.O.P. is marching on.

We practiced every day, Pursell and Coats worked up a sweat;

While the Democrats spent their weeks adding to the national debt.

They tried to legislate themselves some talent, I am willing to bet;

The G.O.P. is marching on.

We can hear the Donkeys whimper, with Chappell leading the whine;

But he shouldn't feel so bad; with that talent they played fine.

After battling against Schaefer, they just got splinters on the pine;

The G.O.P. is marching on.

As their coach, I helped them to accomplish this great feat;

I said, "Hit it to Russo or Bonior; that will ensure their defeat."

So stop crying, old Chappell; get out of the kitchen if you can't stand the heat.

The G.O.P. is marching on.

Now the game is over, one more year 'till 86;

And who will win next year, I know who I would pick.

Don't feel bad, old Chappell; you did well for a Florida hick.

The G.O.P. is marching on.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS TO FILE PRIVILEGED REPORT ON DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 1986

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations may have until midnight tonight to file a privileged report on a bill making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1986, and for other purposes.

Mr. CONTE reserved all points of order on the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

REDESIGN AND RECONSTRUCTION OF THE EAST PLAZA OF THE CAPITOL FOR INCREASED SECURITY

(Mr. YOUNG of Missouri asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. YOUNG of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, today, I am introducing legislation which authorizes the Architect of the Capitol, under the direction of the Senate Office Building Commission and the House Office Building Commission, to redesign and reconstruct the east plaza of the U.S. Capitol to

provide for increased security and for esthetic purposes. I am pleased to be joined in introducing the bill by the distinguished ranking minority member of the Subcommittee on Public Buildings and Grounds, Hon. E. CLAY SHAW, as well as several other distinguished Members of Congress. Mr. Speaker, this bipartisan effort is part of the crucial response to security needs of which we have become all too aware in recent years.

As my colleagues are aware, in November 1983, a bombing was carried out in the Senate wing of the Capitol by an extremist organization. The Subcommittee on Public Buildings and Grounds subsequently held hearings on increased security for the Capitol, and several additional security measures were implemented. This legislation is another important step toward updating security, while at the same time providing a ceremonial entrance to the Capitol substantially in accord with the Olmsted plan for the U.S. Capitol Grounds and the landscape plan of the 1981 master plan for the U.S. Capitol. It will provide for use of the east plaza as a major pedestrian and ceremonial entrance point appropriate for the main entrance to the Capitol of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that the Congress will recognize the importance of this legislation so that we can move quickly to detailed plans which will protect employees and visitors to the Capitol while ensuring that the east front reflects the pride which all Americans feel for the Capitol as a symbol of democracy. I urge my colleagues to cosponsor this legislation and support timely passage.

INTRODUCTION OF LEGISLATION TO IMPROVE SECURITY OF EAST FRONT PLAZA OF THE CAPITOL

(Mr. SHAW asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SHAW. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to introduce along with the chairman of the Public Works and Transportation Subcommittee on Public Buildings and Grounds and sponsor of the bill, Mr. YOUNG of Missouri, and a number of my colleagues, legislation intended to substantially improve the security of the east front plaza of the Capitol.

All of us are keenly aware of the increasing acts of terrorism being carried out worldwide and realize we are as vulnerable here in Washington as the passengers who boarded their flight in Athens or the American soldiers who were senselessly murdered in a cafe in El Salvador.

I know many of you can recall the bomb blast which ripped through the

Capitol 2 years ago, the individual apprehended in the House gallery laden with explosives, and the Columbian and Libyan hit squads headed for Washington and destinations throughout the country.

You will recall, too, the steps which were taken to deter or prevent a repeat of these occurrences. Identification cards were issued, access within the buildings was restricted, trucks were positioned across driveways and guard booths, and idling police cars were stationed in front of the Capitol.

But many of the measures implemented in and around the Capitol following these incidents were of a temporary nature, which is why we have introduced this legislation which would result in a number of permanent security improvements on the east front plaza.

The legislation would authorize the Architect of the Capitol to redesign and reconstruct, under the direction of the House and Senate Office Building Commissions, the east plaza of the Capitol in order to provide improved security for the hundreds of employees and thousands of visitors occupying this majestic building daily.

The redesign is to be in accordance with the Olmstead plan for the U.S. Capitol Grounds and the landscape plan of the 1981 master plan for the U.S. Capitol.

Once plans and cost estimates are prepared by the Architect, the legislation requires they be submitted to the Congress for final approval prior to the appropriation of funds for the reconstruction.

Preliminary estimates by the Architect indicate the entire project would cost approximately \$8.4 million, and I would like to point out that some of the funds for the project may be available from the west front renovation.

Currently, the renovation of the west front is progressing exceptionally well under the careful and diligent supervision of the Architect; the project is on schedule and the costs that have been incurred thus far are well below those originally estimated.

Barring any unforeseen problems, the west front renovation should be completed well below the amount appropriate meaning; funds from this project could be transferred to the east front plaza reconstruction project subject to congressional approval.

Mr. Speaker, improving the security of our Nation's Capitol so we might ensure the protection of the world's most distinguished symbol of freedom, and the safety of those who work and visit there daily, is of paramount importance.

It is that responsibility we must not shirk, and I would urge Members to cosponsor and support this legislation.

IN DEFENSE OF DEMOCRATIC HONOR AND BASEBALL TEAM

(Mr. GONZALEZ asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise in defense of the Democratic honor and the baseball team that fielded gloriously last night and lost through chicanery, but in direct reply to the poesy of the gentleman from Massachusetts, let me say that the Democratic gladiators battled proudly and gloriously and honorably on the field, but at no time could we change the GOP.

The GOP, like my little white hen, Higgly-Piggly, she lays eggs only for gentlemen.

We could not persuade with pistol or lariat to come across for the proletariat.

WAIVING CERTAIN POINTS OF ORDER AGAINST CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3011, DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS, 1986

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 227 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 227

Resolved, That all points of order for failure to comply with the provisions of section 303(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (Public Law 93-344) are hereby waived against the consideration of the bill (H.R. 3011) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1986, and for other purposes. During the consideration of the bill, all points of order against the following provisions in the bill for failure to comply with the provisions of clause 2 of rule XXI are hereby waived: beginning on page 2, lines 1 through 21; beginning on page 4, line 6 through page 6, line 19; beginning on page 8, line 10 through page 9, line 10; beginning on page 9, line 16 through page 10, line 2; beginning on page 11, line 11 through page 12, line 8; beginning on page 13, lines 3 through 26; beginning on page 14, lines 19 through 22; beginning on page 16, line 8 through page 17, line 9; beginning on page 26, line 8 through page 27, line 19; beginning on page 41, lines 12 through 21; beginning on page 45, line 20 through the colon on page 50, line 5; beginning after the colon on page 50, line 8 through page 50, line 16; beginning on page 52, line 12 through page 53, line 18; beginning on page 56, line 16 through page 57, line 15; beginning on page 61, line 3 through page 63, line 8; and beginning on page 65, lines 1 through 4; and all points of order against the following provisions in the bill for failure to comply with the provisions of clause 6 of rule XXI are hereby waived: beginning on page 45, line 20 through page 48, line 24; and beginning on page 52, line 12 through page 53, line 18. In any case where this resolution waives points of order against only a portion of a paragraph, a point of order against any other provision in such paragraph may be made only against

such provision and not against the entire paragraph.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. FROST] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. QUILLEN], pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 227 waives certain points of order against the consideration of H.R. 3011, the Department of the Interior and related agencies appropriation for fiscal year 1986. The rule does not provide for the consideration of H.R. 3011, since general appropriation bills are privileged; rather, the rule protects specified provisions of the bill against points of order for failure to comply with the provisions of clauses 2 and 6 of rule XXI. Clause 2 of rule XXI prohibits unauthorized appropriations and legislative provisions in a general appropriation bill while clause 6 prohibits reappropriations or transfers in those bills.

The specific provisions of the bill for which the waivers are provided are detailed in the rule by page and line. I should note that the waivers provided in the rule are those requested by the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, Mr. WHITTEN.

In large part, the provisions protected by clause 2, rule XXI waivers in the rule are unauthorized appropriations which are at some stage of the legislative process but have yet to be enacted into law. Generally, the granting of these waivers requested by Chairman WHITTEN was not found to be objectionable by the relevant legislative committees. However, in one instance, the authorizing committee, Energy and Commerce, did object to the language proposed to be protected by a waiver of clause 2 of rule XXI. This language, which prohibits the test sale of oil from the strategic petroleum reserve, was not protected in the rule by the Committee on Rules in light of the objection raised by the chairman of the Committee on Energy and Commerce. It has generally been the practice of the Committee on Rules not to grant protection to unauthorized projects or legislative language contained in appropriation bills if such language is found to be objectionable by the relevant legislative committees.

However, in order to protect the remainder of this paragraph in the bill, the rule provides that should a point of order be raised against the test sale language, that the point of order may be made only against that language in the paragraph and not against the paragraph as a whole. This provision in the rule leaves the remainder of the paragraph relating to the strategic petroleum reserve protected against

points of order under clause 2 of rule XXI.

The paragraphs granted a waiver of clause 2, rule XXI in title I of the bill provide appropriations for a number of agencies involved in activities related to the programs of the Department of the Interior including the Bureau of Land Management; resource management, land acquisition and construction within the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service; funds for operations, construction and the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts within the National Park Service; the Geological Survey; and Administration of Territories. Waivers of clause 2, rule XXI in title II are provided for the Youth Conservation Corps within the Forest Service; various programs within the Department of Energy; Indian Health Services within the Department of Health and Human Services; the Smithsonian Institution; the National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities; and the U.S. Holocaust Memorial Council.

The rule also protects three provisions in title II against points of order against the failure to comply with clause 6 of rule XXI. These provisions are also protected by clause 2, rule XXI waivers. Specifically, the rule protects the clean coal technology reserve and the fossil energy research and development accounts within the Department of Energy because they contain transferred funds and the appropriation for the Indian Health Service within the Department of Health and Human Services because it contains reappropriations.

The rule also waives section 303(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 because the rule was reported from the Committee on Rules prior to the adoption of House Resolution 231 which was just agreed to by the House. Under the provisions of House Resolution 231, this waiver is no longer necessary because the House is now operating under the House-passed budget resolution, House Concurrent Resolution 152, as if it had been adopted by the Congress for purposes of the Budget Act. As Members know, once the first budget resolution has been adopted by the Congress, a waiver of section 303(a), which prohibits the consideration of new budget authority for a fiscal year prior to the adoption of a budget resolution for that year, is no longer required in order to consider appropriation bills.

Mr. Speaker, there is one matter of some controversy in the rule I should point out to my colleagues. The Committee on Rules did not provide a waiver of clause 2, rule XXI for an amendment relating to the Synthetic Fuels Corporation. The amendment, proposed by the gentleman from Indiana, Mr. SHARP, as well as a number of other Members, proposed to rescind oil funds in the energy security reserve,

which is the Synthetic Fuels Corporation, except for \$500 million which the SFC would be unable to commit. The amendment was not considered by the Appropriations Committee nor did that committee request that an amendment of this nature be protected under the rule.

Proponents of the amendment will speak today in favor of defeating the rule in order to compel the Committee on Rules to report another rule for H.R. 3011 which would protect the Syn Fuels amendment. I would like to point out from the outset that authorizing legislation has been reported from the Committee on Energy and Commerce and is currently pending before the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs. The Committee on Rules was informed that the Subcommittee on Economic Stabilization will take up the legislation after the August district work period. The Committee on Rules has been, and continues to be, reluctant to grant waivers to allow legislative amendments to appropriation bills and while a great many Members may argue that this amendment would deserve special treatment despite the committee's reluctance, the Committee on Rules continues to believe that the legislative process must be protected and that authorizations should take their normal course through the legislative process. For this reason, the Committee on Rules did not recommend that the amendment be protected in the rule. I would urge my colleagues to support the position of the Committee on Rules, as well as the Committee on Appropriations, and vote to support this rule.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 3011 contains important appropriations for a wide variety of programs within the Department of the Interior and other related agencies. The rule provides for the expeditious consideration of this measure and will allow the House to move forward with the consideration of general appropriation bills for the coming fiscal year. I urge my colleagues to support the previous question and the rule so that the House may conduct its business on this most important appropriation bill.

□ 1220

Mr. QUILLIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may use.

Mr. Speaker, I urge support for the rule.

Today, the House is faced with an important decision regarding our national energy policy and our national security. A bipartisan group of Members argue that this rule should be defeated so that the Rules Committee will be forced to grant another rule permitting the offering of a nongermane amendment to abolish the Synthetic Fuels Corporation. These Members are sincere and able. I have

the greatest respect for them. I count them as my friends. My duty and responsibility as I see it, however, compels me to say that they are wrong, and I ask the House to reject their advice and to reject their policy.

Members should be aware that a bill to accomplish their purpose to abolish the Synthetic Fuels Corporation has been reported by the Committee on Energy and Commerce and is now before the Subcommittee on Economic Stabilization of the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs. The subcommittee chairman, the gentleman from New York [Mr. LaFalce], assured the Rules Committee in a letter that he has every intention of taking up their bill after the August recess. Here is the proper and regular legislative remedy for those who wish to press ahead in their effort to abolish the Synthetic Fuels Corporation.

To reverse our national energy policy and to destroy our most innovative national program to establish a synthetic fuels industry by way of a single amendment debated for a few minutes, is not the sort of deliberate legislative procedure this important matter deserves. What they are about is too serious a national policy question to be dealt with by such an irregular and impromptu procedure.

Beyond this procedural dispute lies the greater question of substance. And what a difference a few years make.

The great oil shortages of the 1970's are behind us. The economic devastation, the wild inflation, the high unemployment, the genuine threat to our national security, all apparently gone, behind us. Today there is an adequate supply of oil and the attitude seems to be that we have no problem with oil supplies anymore.

How quickly we forget. The truth is that America is dangerously dependent on imported oil and a lot of it comes from a part of the world infested with rulers who are sworn enemies of the United States. The Middle East is spinning off its axis under the assaults of a vicious terrorism, or religious fanaticism, of belligerent nationalism, of incredible disparities of wealth, and is afflicted with the agonies of a traditional culture hammered by rapid change introduced by an alien world. They are even rerunning World War I, or is it the Hundred Years' War, at the head of the Persian Gulf.

This is a stable source of oil?

And remember, if we learned anything in the 1970's, it is that America's economy, her foreign policy and her national security depend on America's capacity to establish our own independent energy market—one that we control.

The Synthetic Fuels Corporation is the most important part of America's commitment to free herself from the

grip of the madmen and the crazies of the Middle East who hate her and who will use the oil weapon to bring America to her knees if they can. We have got to have the strength to stop them. We have got to have the vision to go forward and to develop a synthetic fuels industry.

We have sufficient coal and oil shale to last for centuries. Let's use it, instead of sending our sons to die some day in the sands of the Middle East in an oil war.

Mr. Speaker, I ask the Members to support the Appropriations Committee and the Rules Committee. Let us not act unwisely and in haste today on a matter of such importance. I ask for a "yes" vote on the rule.

□ 1230

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. QUILLEN] has consumed 5 minutes.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MURTHA].

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Speaker, this morning when I was driving into work, on my left was a Subaru, in front of me was a Honda and behind was another foreign car. I see the chairman of the Trade Committee coming in. Let me tell you something: They are all burning, one-third of those cars, not only coming in from overseas, but they are burning foreign-imported oil.

Now the steel mills, we have lost 200,000 people in the last couple of years. My area still has between 11 and 13 percent unemployment because of subsidized imports. They say in automobiles alone 50 percent of the cars are going to be imported in the next couple of years if the Japanese eliminate the voluntary quotas that they have received.

Interesting thing: This morning in my mail from a fellow named Broyhill, a Paul Broyhill, I received a letter and Paul says "The furniture business is going downhill and the subsidized imports are killing" him and something has to be done about it.

He sends me a copy of what imports are doing to this country.

Well there have been some of us who have been working for years trying to do something about imports.

In today's Washington Post, the headline "Long-Term Oil Problem." In last week's Washington Post, another, "U.S. May Face Power Deficit in the Early 1990's."

We are talking about, in my estimation, one of the most serious situations to face this country.

I remember driving back from Johnstown, PA, to Washington just a couple of years ago when I had to plan where I was going to stop because half the gasoline stations were closed. I had to be very careful what day I got back and make sure I filled my tank before I left Johnstown.

Now I have a copy of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD here from 1953. We closed down two synthetic fuel plants in 1953, that is, the Congress. The Interior Committee of the Committee on Appropriations said in 1953 that we have no energy crisis, there is not going to be any problem so we are going to close down two plants.

Now what is the significance of closing those plants? The real expenditure in synthetic fuels is the capital expenditure. Those plants cost substantially less in 1953 than they would cost today. So the real crisis might have been avoided if we were able to keep those plants going, expand and increase the technology and to keep the price of the initial investment down.

Now you talk about the amount of money which we spend. Well, let me tell you something: Imported oil costs us \$47 billion a year to our trade deficit. We are going to spend money in the long run in keeping some technology in this country. I am not talking about foreign aid, I am not talking about a program—and I supported the foreign aid bill because we need a balanced program—but let me tell you something here, here is a program that would help us be more independent, here is a program where people in the United States are going to be working.

Mr. Speaker, I got a letter from the United Mineworkers and they said that we have half our people out of work and we need a program that would put coalminers back to work.

You may argue about the situation at the Synthetic Fuels Corporation. But they have only had 6 months under the new board to get anything done. You can go back and look at the discouraging problems they had before and I know it is very difficult to defend the situation under the former regime, but since December, they have tried to narrow down the program and they have tried to increase the productivity, they have tried to make smaller projects and come up with something in case we have another energy crisis.

It is not beyond the realm of possibility that we are going to have an energy crisis within the next couple of years. This expenditure that we make today could be some of the best money spent in this country as far as I can see.

So I say to you today they have reported out a bill, that is the authorizing committee, and appropriately so. We will fight it out in their bill, but certainly we should not make the same mistake today we made in 1953 when we shut down two synthetic fuel plants, with the expenditures they made in those days which might have helped us during that energy crisis. We should make sure that we vote for the previous question and vote for the rule and to keep the prospects of being less dependent on foreign oil and re-

ducing the amount of money and the deficit that we spend for foreign oil in this country.

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BROYHILL].

Mr. BROYHILL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, there are a number of Members on our side who would like to have time and I may have to yield to them.

Mr. Speaker, I do join with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle who are concerned that the Rules Committee did not give us the opportunity to vote on an amendment that would save the American people potentially several billions of dollars.

Now the gentleman from Pennsylvania who just spoke, who just left the well, Mr. Speaker, is a good friend of mine and certainly I share his concern about imports. But this amendment has nothing to do with that. We are talking about a program that is spending billions of dollars needlessly by subsidizing fuel for America.

We are talking about a corporation that has been pouring billions down a rathole.

Our budget deficit demands some action. This is not the place to talk about the import problem or try to come up with solutions to the import problem.

We sorely need to do that. The gentleman from Pennsylvania knows I am willing to join with him in coming up with solutions to that problem. But I do not see how we can continue to permit the Synthetic Fuels Corporation, which as I see it is a monument to corporate welfare and bureaucratic waste, I do not see how we can permit that corporation to continue untouched while we are here talking about, which we did earlier this morning, about reducing farm supports, reducing funding for Medicare and transportation, just to name a few.

Unlike many of these programs that I have mentioned where we are contributing to the well-being of our constituents, I do not feel that the Synthetic Fuels Corporation is contributing to anything but the well-being of its officers and employees.

The development of synthetic fuels technology, Mr. Speaker, is taking place but if real progress is being made, it is happening in spite of the Synthetic Fuels Corporation and not because of it, in the private sector.

I just do not believe it makes sense to spend massive amounts of taxpayer dollars to develop these white elephant/pink elephant type of plans in order to demonstrate technologies that are not even remotely economical.

I am certain as the gentleman from Pennsylvania mentioned in his remarks, the majority of our Members

here feel as I do, Mr. Speaker, that something has to be done about the budget. Here is a chance to do it. Legislation is pending that would deal with this subject but we need to do something on this appropriations bill in order to reduce the funding for this particular program.

I think there is a momentum building here to do something about this and it is only a matter of time before this corrective legislation that I am talking about will come before the House. But we cannot wait that long. We have got to act now. The time is now. Synthetic Fuels Corporation could commit all of its funds available to it and once that happens, there is nothing we can do. When that bill comes before us, we will say that we will have already spent the money. We can do something about it now, prevent hundreds of billions of dollars from being poured down the rathole.

□ 1240

Mr. COUGHLIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my strong opposition to the rule governing the debate on the fiscal year 1986 Interior Department appropriations bill.

My opposition to this rule is based upon its overt protection of the Synthetic Fuels Corporation and the outright ban on offering an amendment to rescind \$7.4 billion of its remaining appropriations.

We have fought this battle before. Last year the House only was allowed to work its will on the Synthetic Fuels Corporation when it defeated a similar rule banning synfuels amendments. We must do so again this year for several important reasons.

First, the Synthetic Fuels Corporation is an expense we can no longer afford. Designed to convert our vast reserves of coal and oil shale into liquid transportation fuels, we have learned that this mandate cannot be met. Synthetic fuels technologies are immature and much farther from commercial viability than had been anticipated. We have realized that synthetic fuels technologies are uneconomical and require massive Federal subsidies. In fact, the price of synfuels has risen from \$60 to \$90 per barrel of oil equivalent while the price of oil continues to decline below \$30 per barrel.

Doesn't it seem ironic that we will allow billions of dollars, as much as \$7.9 billion, to be spent on the commercialization of uneconomic and immature technologies when, at the same time, we are desperately searching for ways to reduce the deficit.

I maintain that the House must not spend billions of dollars on an industry that requires continued subsidization to develop unproven technologies which present environmental, public health and worker safety risks. We should not drain our limited resources

away from productive energy investments. And we should not advocate and finance initiatives which prolong rather than curtail our energy dependence on foreign oil.

Momentum for a change continues to build and it is only a matter of time before corrective legislation is approved by the House. In fact, the House Energy and Commerce Committee has already acted by approving a bill, which I cosponsored, abolishing the Synthetic Fuels Corporation and authorizing a demonstration program.

But we should not wait any longer to stop the flow of red ink in the Federal budget. We should use every opportunity we have, whenever and wherever possible.

Failure to act now will allow the Synthetic Fuels Corporation to continue to commit most, if not all, of the billions of dollars it has available.

It is incumbent upon this House that we not let this happen. Our chance to prevent this wasteful expenditure is to vote down the rule.

I urge a "no" vote on House Resolution 227. A "no" vote will give us the chance to work our will and provide the opportunity to remedy the synthetic fuels mistake without further wasting taxpayers money.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield 6 minutes to the distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WRIGHT].

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this rule. I hope we will follow this orderly process. I recognize that there are people with a certain degree of zealotry who have been trying now for several years to do away with the Synthetic Fuels Program that we launched in 1980 in an effort to recoup our strength and build energy independence in this country so that never again would we be vulnerable to the kind of blackmail that we suffered in 1973 and again in 1979.

I know that memories are short and there are people now consumed with newer demands and newer alarms who have forgotten how desperately this country was smitten, and our economy actually brought to its knees by the Arab oil embargo of 1979.

That might have been prevented if we had followed the counsels of visionary people in 1952 and 1953. The President then had appointed a Paley Commission which recommended to us that we needed to develop a synthetic fuels capacity principally from coal if we were to stave off a disastrous dependence upon foreign oil.

Well, we didn't listen. I have before me here a copy of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of April 27, 1953, and it is to help us avoid the very mistake that our colleagues of that earlier date made that I want to read to you what they did.

"In the table above," I am reading from the RECORD, "the only appreciable change from the amounts allowed in the current fiscal year is for the Synthetic Liquid Fuels Program. It was reported to the committee that the Secretary proposed to put the synthetic liquid fuel demonstration plans at Louisiana, Missouri in standby."

Well, now, was that because it was not doing its work? No; quite the contrary. It was reported to the committee that "refinements accomplished to date in these processes have brought the cost of producing gasoline down to within a few cents of being commercially competitive."

"The Bureau of Mines has been operating another synthetic fuels demonstration plant at Rifle, CO, from which gasoline has been made from oil shale." Now, this process was reported to be even closer costwise to being commercially competitive.

Now the committee has therefore concluded, what; that we have got a good thing going? And that we ought to move it on until it is commercially competitive, until it is a reality? No. The committee has concluded, therefore, that it is time to close the Rifle plant also, the Bureau appears to have done an excellent job in leading the way in these important developments.

They were content with scientific theory, but my colleagues, we cannot be content only with the scientific theory which we know will prove itself. The Germans proved that they could run the Luftwaffe and the Wehrmacht for many, many months after the realities of World War II would have caused them to crumble because they had the capacity to build a synthetic fuels plant and to convert that soft brown coal from the Ruhr Valley into high-grade aviation gasoline.

Now what they did, for goodness sake, we can do; but we cannot do it unless we have enough lead time. So in 1980, we resolved that this Congress was going to mandate that the Government of the United States make us energy independent by 1990; that it produce actual, ongoing production of a commercial-scale plant, of many commercial-scale plants, so that we would have a total of 2 million barrels, not less, by 1990, of commercial production.

Why is that important to us? Wholly aside from our military dependency is our economic dependency. The second biggest problem facing us right after the budget deficits is the trade deficit, robbing us of some \$150 billion from our economy, and maybe 4 or 5 million American jobs this year; and the biggest single contributor to that trade deficit is our dependence on foreign petroleum products.

It has not grown better; it has grown worse in these intervening 6 years since 1979. Then we were importing

only crude oil. Today, after having closed down about 150 domestic petroleum refining plants, we are importing not only crude oil, but refined petroleum products as well.

Is it our destiny? Are we willing to accept a second rate status among the nations? Are we willing to say that oil and energy, those things that are the lifeblood of our economy, are something that we are willing to be dependent upon foreign sources for?

Let me just say this: Obviously what we have done is imperfect; obviously many people appointed to this commission have not really believed in its mission and have not performed in an exemplary way, but this program is vital to our national security in the future.

If the Defense Department had in it some people who were not operating in a way that you would like for them to operate, what would you do? Would you abolish the Defense Department? I do not think so. I think we would get rid of the people who had not been well-performing and replace them with people who believed in the mission that we had given to the Defense Department; and that is what I suggest we do today.

The great Committee on Science and Technology does not want this action taken today; they want this rule adopted in order that that great committee may have the opportunity to look at provisions that would aim at curtailing activities on the part of this board rather than just simply doing away with it.

I urge you, in the interests of the future security of the United States, maybe not tomorrow, maybe not next year, to vote wisely for the rule and let any recommendations to do away with this program follow the regular legislative process and not be rushed through here in a moment of passion today, only that we may regret it or our predecessors or our successors regret it in future years as we regret this unwise action of our predecessors of 1953.

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. REGULA].

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the rule. There are three major reasons that will be offered today for not supporting this rule, and I would like to address each of those.

First is the matter of cost. I would point out to my colleagues that if you use apples and apples in evaluating this bill, you would discover that we are about \$300 million under fiscal 1985. Obviously you can get different kinds of numbers. However, I would make it very clear that because we have forward funded SPRO in 1984, that to get a valid comparison you have to include that money in fiscal year 1985. Given that fact, we are in

effect freezing at 1985 levels minus \$315 in this bill.

The administration, of course, has sent out some letters on this, and they would point out that we are over the administration's request in terms of the amount of money that is in the bill.

We took into account, in this bill, the pay raise, and factored that in, because the administration just a few days ago indicated that they are going to support the pay raise and have withdrawn the request for the 5-percent reduction.

□ 1250

Factoring that into their numbers, this bill would then be \$900 million over the administration's request.

But let me point out a few things: The administration did not request any money for land acquisition. I think it is unreal, given the fact that one-third of America is owned by the Federal Government to not do any acquisition. There are adjacent lands that ought to be acquired for parks, for the Bureau of Land Management, and for national forests including in holdings, and similar lands, that need to be acquired in fiscal year 1986. Therefore, we put in approximately \$144 million to do that.

The administration cut drastically the maintenance amount. Even though we have committed \$1 billion in the last few years to improving the quality of the park experience and the forest experience for the people of this Nation, they now want to stop going forward with safety improvements, with health improvements with highways, with the things that are important. This is in spite of the fact that visitations to the national parks are substantially higher.

The administration cuts back on Indian health. Like it or not, we have a responsibility to the Indian population of this country to maintain basic health standards. Therefore, we address that; also we address the matter of soil and water problems in the national lands.

Let me say to all of you again that we are talking about one-third of America, 730 million acres are affected by this bill, and therefore it is important that we address these concerns adequately.

I think the impact of this is illustrated by the fact that we have requests in our subcommittee from 249 Members of the House of Representatives. More than half of the Members submitted requests to us, saying in effect, "This is important in terms of a Federal piece of land in my district that you do this." We tried to respond to those requests.

For all of these reasons, we were over the minimum budget submitted by the administration. I think we did a remarkable job in only going over \$900

million, considering the 249 requests from Members of this House, in addition to the needs that I have just outlined.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REGULA. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. REGULA] has expired.

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 additional minute to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. REGULA].

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman spoke of the numbers of Members of the House who appeared before our committee and requested certain actions be taken, which we did, in most instances. About 60 Members, if my memory serves me correctly, came in and asked the committee to take steps to inaugurate a clean coal technology program. And based upon those requests and upon the country's needs we provided for a transfer of \$750 million from the Energy Security Reserve to the Department of Energy to carry out that program.

Mr. REGULA. I thank the gentleman.

I would add two things. In there we included a requirement that the cost sharing be a minimum of 50 percent from anyone participating, in clean coal programs. Therefore, they have to put their own money up front to get support for the projects. We limit expenditures to \$100 million next year.

One last comment, because others will address the Synfuels issues, and that is that this bill is a net revenue producer. We appropriate today, if we pass this bill and this rule, \$8.2 billion. The U.S. Treasury will receive from the sale of oil and gas rights, mineral rights, forest products, and other miscellaneous items a total of \$12.5 billion. This will net the Treasury \$4.3 billion.

Mr. DREIER of California. Mr. Speaker, the time is long overdue for Congress to concede its error and cut its losses by rescinding funds for the continuation of the Synfuels Corporation. At its best Synfuels is a boondoggle, and at worst a careless waste of public revenue the supply of which is increasingly stretched thin.

The SFC was ill conceived in the panic of the 1979 fuels crisis. It promised an eventual solution to our Nation's dependency on foreign energy while guaranteeing a flow of oil and gas from previously untapped resources. In fact, the only flow consisted of billions of tax dollars coursing their way into a bottomless well of waste and mismanagement. The fuels obtained thus far haven't amounted to a trickle.

The highly touted centerpiece of the SFC, the Great Plains Coal Gasification Project, has become a public em-

barrassment—and a case in point for the dismantling of his misbegotten agency. After significant start up problems, fortunately the plant is able to produce synthetic gas. More precisely though, for every \$3 of gas produced at Great Plains, the Government spends \$10. That's some return on investment. So far, the project's cost to the taxpayer includes \$1.5 billion drawn from \$2 billion in Federal loan guarantees. Additionally, the project's contractors are negotiating \$720 million in price guarantees to insure payment of money already owed the Treasury.

Synfuels' other projects, though somewhat limited in number, can boast of similar accomplishments. The taxpayer has taken a very expensive bath in the corporation's best intentions. Meanwhile, the SFC retains one of the most highly paid bureaucracies in the history of government spending. Almost \$53 million in salaries and administrative costs have been rung up in the last 5 years. That's for a staff which has never exceeded 200.

The urgent need for synthetic fuels has been considerably relaxed by the turn of energy events since 1980. Oil and gas price estimates which justified the SFC at that time have not been born out. The major players in the private energy industry have withdrawn from their expanded R&D efforts to synthesize fuel continuing their efforts in correspondence with current needs and the dictates of the reduced marketplace. These corporations have taken the necessary steps to retrench following the popping of the energy crisis bubble.

The lack of necessity in light of the SFC's stated goals leave this agency with a lot of money and no where to spend it. This fact, combined with the agency's lackluster history of management, should convince its remaining congressional supporters to vote for a reallocation of Synfuels funds while putting a quiet end to a body has so little to be proud of.

I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on the Interior appropriation rule to hasten the redirecting of our energies and funds away from a public agency because it has become a public embarrassment. Let's admit the well intentioned mistake of creating the Synfuels Corporation in the haste of potential crisis in favor of recovering these resources for use in counteracting the clearly recognized crisis of the Federal budget.

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. COATS].

Mr. COATS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge my colleagues to defeat the rule providing for consideration of H.R. 3011, the Interior and related agencies fiscal year 1986 appropriations. I oppose the rule because it does not allow for an amendment to rescind

\$6 billion from the Synthetic Fuels Corporation.

The Energy and Commerce Committee recently voted overwhelmingly to abolish the agency and establish in its place a \$500 million scaled-down Synfuels Assistance Program at the Department of Energy. Common sense tells us that to proceed with anything more would be an unwise and unneeded expenditure of scarce taxpayers funds.

The record of the Synthetic Fuels Corporation speaks for itself. The Corporation has compiled a record of inaction, excessive salaries and pensions, and has not brought about the efficient or cost-effective commercialization of synfuels that sponsors originally anticipated. To spend excessively for synfuels in the name of "energy security" will only waste billions of dollars when budget deficits are already at an all-time high.

If the Congress does not act swiftly, billions of dollars may be obligated by the Synfuels Corporation without any congressional review. When the Corporation was created, it was insulated from congressional review by being authorized through 1992 and received its \$15 billion appropriation in one lump sum. Time and circumstances have dramatically altered the need for a synfuels program of the size and with the mission that Congress originally authorized.

The full House of Representatives should have the opportunity to vote on the rescission of Synfuels funds.

I urge a no vote on the rule.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL].

Mr. DINGELL. I thank the distinguished gentleman from Texas for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, if this rule is rejected, my colleagues on the Rules Committee can go back up to the Rules Committee and can craft a rule which will enable the rescission of funds for the Synthetic Fuels Corporation; the House will be able to debate the actions of the Synthetic Fuels Corporation; the actions will not bear the test of scrutiny; we can proceed then to adopt what is an otherwise excellent bill; and we can then proceed to address the question of what ought to be done about the Synthetic Fuels Corporation. I urge—and this is the first time in 30 years' service in this body—I urge the rejection of the rule so that those issues can be properly addressed by this body.

If we defeat this rule, I trust that the Rules Committee will understand and be responsive to our reasoning, and craft a new rule to enable the House to have the opportunity to vote on a synfuels rescission amendment. Over all, the bill is an excellent one. I commend the Rules Committee, and I

understand why it has done what it has, nevertheless, I think the rule must be objected to by the body.

The Interior appropriations bill is generally an excellent one, but the rule forecloses opportunity to deal with the basic issue.

Now, do not think that I am alone in this view. I just want to read from my old friend, Tom Corcoran. He says: It is preposterous to develop billions in synthetic fuel subsidies when we are faced with a massive budget deficit, cuts in social spending and high interest rates.

He is the vice chairman of that institution. They waste money. They have established a standard of living that exceeds that of any Government corporation. They have more people who make more than \$80,000 a year than all of the rest of the government put together. Their first official act, or one of them, was to hire lawyers to figure out how they could keep information away from Congress.

In the entire life of that institution, they have approved three projects, gigantic white elephants, none of which can pay out.

Now, if you are interested in fiscal responsibility, understand we have here an opportunity to save \$6 billion. Last year, in the hope that the Synfuels Corporation and its officers would reform and would move forward and provide Federal assistance for projects which would have merit, I supported the continued existence of the corporation. They have been tried; they are now found wanting. They waste. They construct enormous white elephants at vast costs to the taxpayers, instead of developing the technology and putting in place the size projects that will enable this country to move toward independence.

The arguments about imports and all of the other good questions are matters of concern. Developing coal, and liquid fuels therefrom, are extremely important. But the Synthetic Fuel Corporation in all of its years has not done anything about those problems.

So I say let us simply recognize they have not done what they are supposed to do. Let us abolish them, let us set up an appropriate size program in the Department of Energy, and let us move forward then toward the steps that will move this Nation toward a measure of energy independence based on good research, based upon responsible conduct in public office.

I would point out to my colleagues that at issue here are billions of dollars of taxpayers' moneys that can be saved. The savings will be small at first, but, believe me, dear friends, they will grow.

I yield to no man in affection for the majority leader. But on this he has a

blind side, and his views should be rejected.

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONTE].

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this rule providing for the consideration of H.R. 3011, making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for fiscal year 1986. I do so because of the failure of the rule to permit me to offer an amendment to the Interior appropriations bill that would rescind funds previously appropriated for the Synthetic Fuels Corporation. It is clear that the time has come to stop the corporate subsidies and give-aways for the fat cats of the oil industry. But the only way to do that is to defeat this rule.

Back in 1980, when the Synthetic Fuels Corporation was first funded, synthetic fuels were the wave of the future. But since then, oil scarcity has turned to glut, and the price of imported oil has dropped dramatically. Just this week, we have been treated to the welcome news of OPEC oil ministers squabbling among themselves in an effort to stop the over-production and price cutting that threatens to destroy OPEC's stranglehold on the world's oil supply.

During our debate on this issue last year, several Members pointed to the instability in the Persian Gulf, the ongoing war between Iran and Iraq, and attacks on oil tankers, as evidence of the need to proceed full speed with the development of our synthetic fuel resources. What has the past year taught us?

It has taught us that despite continued and even increasing instability and conflict in the Middle East, our oil supply remains virtually unencumbered. Since last year, our dependence upon Middle Eastern oil has continued to decline, as ever-increasing portions of our oil imports come from our South American neighbors.

The past year has taught us that despite the best intentions of those who bailed out the Synthetic Fuels Corporation last year, the sweetheart deals, enormous subsidies, and outrageous life styles of Synfuels Corporation employees have continued.

As a result of continued filling of the strategic petroleum reserve, we are today in an even better position to withstand an enforced reduction in oil imports than we were a year ago.

We've been hearing a lot over the past several months about the budget deficit—well, here's the best opportunity we'll see in a long time to make a real cut. At a time when budget conferees are talking about cuts in food stamps and increasing the taxes on our elderly Social Security recipients, how can we even think about continuing to pay Union Oil a million dollars

a day in price supports for 6 years—and that's in addition to the \$3.4 billion in tax breaks!

When the budget conferees are talking about cutting transportation funds by 15 percent, how can we even think about providing billions of dollars in taxpayer subsidies to guarantee a return of over 20 percent for one of the most profitable companies in the Fortune 500.

How can we explain to those constituents back home who are breaking their backs 40 hours a week, sweating to pay taxes, that we didn't do anything to reduce the deficit, to bring down interest rates, to save billions of dollars when we had the chance?

Mr. Speaker, the Synthetic Fuels Corporation has had its chance. It should have been killed a year ago. The past year has given us just more of the same—more money wasted on staff perks and privileges, more money wasted on subsidies for oil companies to build plants that don't now and perhaps never will work, more money wasted on technology that won't be economical for at least 20 years, and more empty promises that the Corporation will be brought under control.

The Synthetic Fuels Corporation has proven beyond a shadow of a doubt that it is incapable of bringing itself under control. Now it is up to Congress to put this monster out of its misery.

I urge the defeat of this rule so that my amendment can be offered.

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. RUDD].

Mr. RUDD. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the rule for the consideration of H.R. 3011, the Interior appropriations bill.

Some of my colleagues are opposing this rule because it does not allow for an amendment to rescind funding for the Synthetic Fuels Corporation. Such an amendment is not germane to the bill and would constitute legislation on an appropriations bill.

It's true that we don't need synfuels today. We have adequate supplies of oil and relatively stable prices. But it would be a grave mistake to send the signal only 5 years after authorizing the Synthetic Fuels Corporation that we are no longer serious about pursuing energy independence. We wouldn't cancel the fire insurance on our homes just because we haven't suffered from fire damage over the last 5 years. A fire could break out tomorrow. Just because we're not facing an energy emergency today, there is no reason to believe we will be so secure in the years ahead. About one-third of U.S. energy needs is now satisfied from imports, about the same as in 1973. Synfuels development provides our Nation with crucial insurance protection against increasing dependence on for-

eign sources of energy, particularly the volatile Middle East.

We are already falling behind other countries in synfuels technology. West Germany and Japan are leading the way in direct coal liquefaction. South Africa is leading in indirect coal liquefaction. The synfuels plant in South Africa has proved that we can have synthetic fuels at the rate of about \$2.50 per gallon for gasoline. We cannot continue to lag behind in synfuels technology.

Twice during the 1970's, this Nation found itself grossly unprepared to deal with energy crises. The long gas lines, the prospect of rationing, and the memories of skyrocketing prices appear to have faded, and we are forgetting how vulnerable we can be to manipulation of our energy supplies from abroad. Such manipulation is a serious threat to our national and economic security, and in recognition of this threat, the Defense Department is already working with the Synthetic Fuels Corporation to address defense needs.

Finally, let me point out that the savings from abolishing the Synfuels Corporation are grossly inflated. Synfuels support comes mainly in the form of price supports and loan guarantees. Under the best scenario, the projects would not cost the Synfuels Corporation any money. Indeed, in a July 9, 1985, letter to the Energy and Commerce Committee, the Congressional Budget Office said that abolishing the agency and authorizing \$500 million for an R&D program in the Energy Department would reduce estimated budget outlays by only \$332 million from fiscal year 1986-90. This is nowhere near the \$6 billion mentioned by SFC opponents.

I urge the adoption of the rule. Synfuels development is vital to national security and ought to be continued.

□ 1300

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. OXLEY].

Mr. OXLEY. I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to call this opportunity to vote perhaps a "Give us a chance to vote," and that is to give those of us who have some strong feelings about synfuels an opportunity to debate and vote on this very important subject. It seems to me that we have an opportunity here to not only save the taxpayers a great deal of money, but also to make public policy in the sunshine; something that we talked about earlier this morning. So the opportunity is there for all of us to vote down the rule and give these folks on both sides of the aisle an opportunity to debate this very important issue.

The distinguished majority leader has said, I think I quote: "This program is vital to our national security." If this program, as it is currently existing, is vital to our national security, then we are in a lot more trouble than we think, because this program has already authorized \$2.6 billion in spending authority. It has spent \$70 million; it has employed 200 bureaucrats, and what have we got to show for it? Absolutely nothing.

I ask that this vote be resounding against the rule.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. PERKINS].

Mr. PERKINS. I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to urge an affirmative vote on ordering the previous question and also on approval of this rule. It is absolutely vital to the national security and economic health of our Nation that the synthetic fuels program continue.

A little over 32 years ago, on April 27 and 28, 1953, this House debated on whether or not to add \$2 million to the Department of Interior appropriation bill to continue in operation three synthetic fuel plants operated by the Bureau of Mines. In 1953, the Committee on Appropriations proposed that these plants be shut down. These plants were producing gasoline from coal and oil shale within a few cents a gallon as what it cost to refine gasoline from crude oil. This was admitted in the report accompanying the Interior Department's appropriation bill. A coal liquification plant was operating at Louisiana, MO; a coal gasification plant was working at Gorgas, AL; and an oil shale plant was operating at Rifle, CO.

It was said in 1953 that private industry would develop a synthetic fuels industry. Well, we all know what happened. The amendment to add the \$2 million was defeated, the plants were shut down, and nothing happened. The only thing that did happen was that the technology made its way to South Africa which put their Sasol I synthetic fuel plant in operation about 1956.

The United States is importing a significant portion of its energy needs. Let's not forget what occurred during the shortages of the 1970's. This could start tomorrow. All it would take would be for some terrorist to sink a super tanker in the Straits of Hormuz. Then we would have some real gasoline lines.

One of the basic rationales for the 600-ship Navy is to protect the sea lanes to the Middle Eastern oil fields. The basic rationale for the Rapid Deployment Force is also to protect the Middle Eastern oil fields. It is planned to pre-position ships at Diego Garcia so that troops can go ashore in the

Middle East to protect the Arab oil. This Congress has been willing to spend billions of dollars to protect the oil owned by Middle Eastern potentates.

The purchase of imported oil is also a significant cause of our international trade deficit which is devastating the U.S. economy. There are three good reasons to vote yes on the rule. One, for the national security of our Nation; two, to lower the Defense budget by creating a synthetic fuel industry and thereby stopping the need to use American boys to protect the oil of Middle Eastern potentates; and, three, to reduce the Nation's trade deficit.

Mr. Speaker, in my opinion, any one of these reasons is sufficient in and of itself to vote yes on ordering the previous question and yes on this rule.

Mr. Speaker, we cannot today make the same mistake that was made over 32 years ago. It is not often that we will have the opportunity to avoid repeating the mistakes of the past. There is one such opportunity today.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FUQUA].

Mr. FUQUA. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the rule, and I would like to briefly explain why. This vehicle before us is an appropriations bill. It is not a legislative bill; it does not come from a legislative committee.

The Committee on Energy and Commerce has reported a bill that seeks to make certain changes in the Synthetic Fuels Corporation. That bill is now pending before the Banking and Urban Affairs Committee. The Committee on Science and Technology, which I have the honor to chair, has requested sequential referral. We have jurisdiction; we have a great interest in the matter of synthetic fuels.

The Committee on Science and Technology in 1975 brought the first bill to this floor relating to synthetic fuels, so our interest goes a long way back in this particular area. We intend to hold hearings on this legislation. We hope that we can perfect and correct any inequities or errors that have been involved in the Synthetic Fuels Corporation as we know today. But let us not just abolish the agency because we are mad because somebody did something they did not like.

We have had a problem in procurement with the Department of Defense but we did not abolish the Department. We tried to correct the problem. That is what we are trying to do here. I urge my fellow colleagues to give us a chance to orderly work through the legislative process and let the legislative committees that have an interest in this and have had a long and continuing interest in this area give us an opportunity to work through the legis-

lative process and bring a bill to this floor.

It has been reported out of a committee, so it will get to the floor, and then the House will have its opportunity to work it in the proper forum, not as an attachment to an appropriations bill.

If you believe in the legislative process, I hope you will vote for the rule. We will have a bill of some sort on the floor that will be open to amendment. Everybody will have a chance to make their wishes known.

Mr. WIRTH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FUQUA. I yield to my friend from Colorado.

Mr. WIRTH. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I want to associate myself with the gentleman's remarks and the process that ought to be followed, which he has described very well. As a member of both the Commerce Committee and the Science Committee, I have been an advocate of developing an energy independence program which the gentleman has been so much of a leader in, and I would hope that we would follow the regular process in this.

Mr. FUQUA. I appreciate the gentleman's support and I would like to further state that we have worked with all of the committees when this Corporation was created. We have had an interest for a long, long time in synthetic fuels and energy development. Alternative sources of energy. While we may have a glut of energy today, that does not mean that that is going to exist 5 or 10 years from now.

I urge that we let the legislative process work. Vote "aye" on the rule so that we can get on with the business of trying to work through the normal procedures of the House, and not attach something to an appropriations bill that has no business being on there. We worked very closely with the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES] in funding programs, and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. REGULA] in funding programs, particularly in the fossil fuel area. Our interest goes a long way.

I do urge a vote for the rule so we can consider this bill.

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. TAUKE].

Mr. TAUKE. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, it is important for us to act on this critical issue of synfuels today because the train is about to leave the station on a number of major expenditures. One is on the Great Plains project. Let me just briefly discuss the Great Plains project.

The Federal Government put in \$1.5 billion. One point five billion. The private sector put in \$559 million. They

received in tax breaks over \$30 million more than they put into the project—so far, they have a \$30 million profit in tax breaks. They have put in not one nickel of equity.

They are producing fuel that costs \$92 a barrel and so what are they doing? Coming back for a \$720 million subsidy, that if we do not act on today will be granted. A \$720 million subsidy to sell this fuel which they have produced.

It seems to me that we should be appalled at the notion that now the Synfuels Corporation is considering forgiving a good portion of the \$1.5 billion loan we have already put in, and we have said that the private sector can get out by August 1986, meaning the Federal Government would be stuck with over \$2 billion in losses.

This is a boondoggle from the word go, and to stop projects like this, we need to act today. Vote "no" on the rule.

□ 1310

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLINGER].

Mr. CLINGER. I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Speaker, the issue is joined here clearly. Those who are supporting this rule believe that the Synthetic Fuels Corporation has a vital role to play in securing America's energy independence, and it also has a vital role to play in the national security of this country.

Those who oppose this rule are trying to kill the Synthetic Fuels Corporation without giving the House of Representatives an adequate opportunity to really explore the ramifications of that action. The gentleman from Michigan has indicated that we should kill the Synthetic Fuels Corporation today because his committee has fully explored the issues and has arrived at its conclusion. But the fact is that, as the gentleman from Florida indicated, a number of other committees have a very vital interest in this program and have not had an opportunity to work their will and explore what the fallout would be.

Mr. Speaker, I serve as the ranking minority member on the Committee on Government Operations Subcommittee which has oversight jurisdiction over SFC, and we have studied the Corporation extensively. We have studied the outlook for world petroleum markets as well. If anyone doubts the necessity for a viable, commercial-scale synfuels program, they need only look at the increases in U.S. domestic consumption of petroleum products in 1984. They were up 5 percent. We are no longer in the days when we had decreasing consumption.

In addition, U.S. oil imports were up in 1984 by 8 percent. We talk about the deficit. Are we not concerned

about the enormous trade deficit we are running to which oil imports are contributing \$60 billion? We cannot afford the luxury of waiting until another crisis occurs.

A number of well-respected oil economists told us that by 1990 we can expect over one-half of our oil imports to once again come from OPEC nations, and most of that is produced in the Middle East, and I need not remind my colleagues of the unstable conditions that exist in that area of the world.

We can be proactive rather than reactive by supporting the Synthetic Fuels Corporation.

The major arguments we hear against the SFC is that it has been wasteful and abolishing it will cut the deficit by \$6 billion. While there is no doubt that the program has had serious flaws in the past, there are now visible improvements at SFC for two major reasons. No. 1, last year Congress addressed this problem by cutting SFC's authorization by 45 percent and providing that 50 percent of the savings resulting from scaling down its projects would be returned to the Treasury. That was a responsible action. It was instigated by the same group that is opposing the rule today. But that action was barely 1 year ago. Seeking to abolish the Corporation without the opportunity for Congress' intent to be carried out would not be responsible. We have already taken action to put the SFC on the right path, this is not the time to pull the rug out from a program vital to our energy security.

The second factor not addressed by opponents of SFC is the dramatically new approach to project approval and technology selection which the SFC has developed in their new comprehensive strategy. This approach has just been completed and recognizes the wisdom of Congress in cutting the funds last year. The strategy calls for smaller projects, costing less to the taxpayer and putting in place the diversity of technology necessary to have a viable commercial alternative to petroleum. It is a lean and mean approach which we must give time to work.

The biggest argument against SFC is that by cutting it out completely we will save \$6 billion which will have a direct effect on the budget deficit. This is simply not correct. The assistance given by SFC is in price supports and loan guarantees and is not an immediate outlay. The assistance would go to projects in most cases over a period of 10 years. Do not be deceived by the claims of immediate budgetary effects. In fact, a CBO study done for the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL], showed that total budgetary impact of the amendment he seeks to offer would be \$332 million—and that

would be over a 5-year period, through fiscal year 1990.

On the other hand, if SFC were abolished, the Department of Energy would have to come to this body immediately seeking \$1.5 billion to payoff the loan to the Great Plains project which DOE guaranteed. I stress that this would be an immediate dollar outlay of \$1.5 billion. I believe the dollar tradeoff is clear, as is the necessity of acting for the energy security of our Nation. I really would like to see this House act responsibly, taking into account the future policy implications of our actions. The whole story shows us that SFC has built a responsible program, has a new Board to implement it, and is now poised to get us out from behind the threats of foreign imports. A smaller Energy Department R&D program is not the answer. We have gone that route unsuccessfully before.

The time to act is now and the vote to make is in favor of the rule.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. SHARP].

Mr. TAUZIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHARP. I would be happy to yield briefly to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. TAUZIN. I thank my chairman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, we need badly to oppose this rule and to get at the Synfuels Program. The logic of the Synfuels Program today is to commercially put in place projects that will develop synfuels for the future. The logic is so bad because the technologies are changing so fast. We may, in fact, invest billions of dollars, if we do not do something now, in technologies that will be as obsolete tomorrow as some of the personal computers of 5 years ago are today.

That is the kind of bad logic synfuels is engaged in. If we do not vote "no" on the rule, we cannot get into this debate and we cannot save this \$6 billion.

Mr. SHARP. The gentleman is absolutely correct. Let me say procedurally the time is now, substantively the time is now.

Procedurally, we have to understand that it is very difficult for the Congress to get at the synthetic fuels program. Unlike the defense budget, unlike the budget on the domestic side, this was set up to be so insulated that we do not have any kind of annual or 2-year or 4-year review of this program.

We must seize the opportunity now. The only other time Congress got at this program was last year when it did the identical thing we are asking you to do today. Last year the House rejected the Interior appropriations rule

after which another rule came to the floor and we got to debate synfuels and make decisions about it.

Substantively the time is now, ladies and gentlemen, because the Corporation is in a position to commit us to \$6 billion of future deficit spending; we can prevent that now.

Let me suggest to you, as one who supported this program, who sought to give the Reagan administration the opportunity over the last 4 years to make it work, that I cannot buy any longer the arguments that this is the direction in which to go; we can find few energy experts in this country who believe this is a wise place to put the limited number of Federal dollars that we have to spend on energy today.

The deficit cries out for us to cut the budget. It requires us to set firmer priorities, and this is the time to do it on synthetic fuels. If we are interested in coal, as I am interested in coal development, there are much better ways to go about it. This is the most wasteful approach we can take.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to vote against the rule.

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. STRANG].

Mr. STRANG. I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the rule because this has come down to a debate over synthetic fuels. Aside from being an improper forum to decide major issues in Congress, I raised some objections because, referring to the majority leader's comments back in 1953, are my colleagues aware what this Congress did with the coal gasification process that we had developed?

We gave it to South Africa, and it works. They are energy independent. We gave it to South Africa. This is the kind of action that this flagrant abuse of numbers and exaggeration is driving us to today.

We lost our nuclear initiative. We have lost it. We have lost it because we will not permit it to go forward. We are legislating by rescission. That is a mistake.

Talk about cost sharing, Mr. Speaker. Somebody mentioned cost sharing. Are my colleagues aware that on reliance that this Congress meant what it said, Union Oil has spent \$683 million of their own money on their own project in Garfield County, CO?—\$683 million. No taxpayer dollars. There are no synfuels dollars in western Colorado and there will not be for several years because they have to buy product.

What are the people in Florida and California going to do when they move down there for their declining years? They are already energy independent. What are they going to do in 1995 when we have a real, major energy

wreck on our hands? They are going to ask us what we did. They are going to ask us what we did, and I do not know what we are going to tell them. What are we going to tell them? That we just wanted to save a few bucks now and we could not deal with the strategic and long-term importance of energy for this country? Six hundred billion barrels of available oil in the Green River formation alone in Utah and Colorado and we turned our back on it.

What are we going to do in 1995? What are we going to tell the people in Michigan, in Ohio, about the jobs that we create for them for a vehicle that cannot have any gasoline to drive? Have we forgotten the gas lines?

Do not defeat this rule. Mr. Speaker, we are about to go down the same road that our distinguished colleagues, Mr. Perkins of Kentucky and Mr. Aspinall of Colorado warned us against in 1953. Where did our development technology go? We gave it to South Africa. Let us not do that again.

Mr. FROST. May I inquire of the Chair how much time is remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. FROST] has 4 minutes remaining and the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. QUILLEN] has 4 minutes remaining.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES] the chairman of the subcommittee.

Mr. YATES. I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I urge support of this rule. This is a good bill which the Interior Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations has brought to the House. It is a responsible bill.

Members have received a letter from our good friend, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. FRENZEL], in which he says that this bill is over the 1985 bill. That is not true. A true comparison between the amount of the bill that we have brought to the floor and the amount in the 1985 bill shows that we are at least \$55 million below that bill.

□ 1320

We are now \$254 million below our allocation under 302(b) in accordance with the budget that was established under the budget resolution approved by the House. We are in our bill not taking advantage of the so-called 5-percent pay reduction. We have money for the pay of Federal employees in the bill. We are not looking to pay them in a supplemental bill, as has been claimed by other committees.

This is a good bill. I am sorry that we got into the debate on the Synthetic Fuels Corporation. I think that is a subject for the bill that has already been reported by the Energy and Commerce Committee. That bill has been reported, and that bill should be given

the opportunity of being debated on the floor in a legislative procedure rather than in an appropriation procedure.

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Utah [Mr. NIELSON].

Mr. NIELSON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the rule at the risk of offending my ranking minority member, the chairman of my committee, and most of my colleagues on the Energy and Commerce Committee. I strongly support the rule.

I feel the vehicle that was adopted in the Energy and Commerce Committee is the one that should be used in the legislative process. It should come to the floor and be debated on the floor with appropriate amendments. I do not believe it should be in the appropriation bill.

I would like to point out that there are some successes in the Synthetic Fuels Corporation. One small one that I had mentioned is the Geokinetics Corporation which has been energy-efficient. It is already producing oil in an environmentally sound way. There are many others also, and some are in the process of developing tar sands. I believe we should put our eggs in more than one basket. I support the rule, and I would like to deal with the Synthetic Fuels Corporation directly.

Let me make one further rejoinder. We did take \$5 billion out of this Corporation last year. We have not had time to see what effect that has had. They have a new Board. Let us give them a chance to operate and deal with it in a legislative fashion later.

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of the rule.

We have heard debate on the Synthetic Fuels Corporation and how important it is to develop alternate sources of energy. Also, action on the Interior appropriation itself is necessary. I think we must get down to the business of passing this appropriation bill.

In further regard to the Synthetic Fuels Corporation, there are those who say that it is not operating efficiently. If you have a sore on your hand, you do not cut off the hand to cure the sore; you treat the sore. That is what we should do with this Corporation. We should bring it in line and let it do what it was intended to do.

Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of the rule, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLPE].

Mr. WOLPE. Mr. Speaker, there is one overriding issue in the vote we are about to take, and that is whether we are going to allow the slogan of

"energy security" to continue to protect the most wasteful, the most mismanaged agency in the Federal Government, one that is squandering literally billions upon billions of taxpayer dollars, or whether we are really going to do something genuine about our energy security requirements.

Wasting billions of dollars on energy products that cost up to \$90 a barrel of oil equivalent is diverting resources away from those kinds of energy investments that will really reduce our vulnerability to import oil. Let us understand very clearly that a vote for energy security is a no vote on this rule so that Members of this body can begin to hold the Synthetic Fuels Corporation accountable once and for all and so we can put an end to the waste of billions of taxpayer dollars.

Mr. Speaker, let us give Members of this body an opportunity to save 6 billions of taxpayer dollars and make a real contribution to energy security.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I would inquire, has the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. QUILLEN] used all of his time?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. QUILLEN] has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, at the appropriate time I will yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BOLAND], and to account for the balance of my time, I now yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of the rule. Let us not be penny-wise and pound-foolish. Let us go forward and do what we have to do for this Nation to develop alternate sources of energy. Let us pass this rule overwhelmingly and let the appropriate authorizing committees of the House handle this synthetic fuels matter when they bring their bill to the floor.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BOLAND], and after that I will yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I am grateful to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. QUILLEN] for yielding a portion of his time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly support the rule on H.R. 3011, the appropriations bill for the Department of the Interior and related agencies.

I understand the reason for the fight on this rule. A number of Members of this House believe that it's time to pull the plug on the Synthetic Fuels Corporation, and they want the Interior appropriations bill to be the executioner. I oppose this effort on both procedural and substantive grounds.

Mr. Speaker we had this same argument on synthetic fuels last year. As a result of that debate, we approved a sizable rescission in the funds previously appropriated to the Synthetic Fuels Corporation, we put the manag-

ers of that enterprise on notice that we expected them to institute some administrative reforms. Changes have been made as a result of what took place on this floor last August, but some would not give the Corporation a chance to see the fruits of those changes.

This year, the Energy and Commerce Committee has approved a bill which would effectively abolish the Synthetic Fuels Corporation. The Banking Committee has concurrent referral of that bill, and the Science and Technology Committee has requested sequential referral of it. The amendment which would be offered to the Interior appropriations bill if this rule is defeated is the bill reported by the Energy and Commerce Committee. I want to make it clear that I am going to vote against that bill in whatever form it comes to the floor. I think it is a shortsighted measure for which, if approved, we will pay dearly in the future. But I can't help but believe that this institution would be better served if all of the committees with jurisdiction over the various aspects of the Synthetic Fuels Corporation bill had a chance to consider it. There is no good reason, in my judgment, for short-circuiting that process in this case.

Mr. Speaker, where are our memories? The arguments we have heard on this floor against the Synthetic Fuels Corporation would have us disregard both history and common sense. I remember the atmosphere in this Chamber 5 years ago when the Synthetic Fuels Corporation was created. The Members who voted to launch our Nation's synthetic fuels effort, and I was one of them, understood two things. We knew that synthetic fuels were going to be expensive, and we knew that neither the strategic petroleum reserve nor energy conservation were going to provide effective long-term alternatives to imported petroleum. In the intervening 5 years, crude oil prices have fallen and our recollections of gas lines, factory closings, and early school dismissals have faded. You would think our energy problems had disappeared.

Some things have not changed since 1980. We all receive mountains of statistics on energy supplies and energy use. None of those statistics have ever led me to conclude that petroleum is other than a finite resource. No estimates which I have seen have shown that domestic oil and gas reserves, either onshore or offshore, are increasing. In fact, at least since the 1952 report by the Paley Commission we have been warned that the United States will run out of oil and gas. We are not sitting on oceans of oil in this country and we are never going to be. And what's more, Mr. Speaker, our consumption of imported petroleum,

after several years of decline, is again moving toward the levels of the 1970's.

In my judgment, synthetic fuels represent our only path to energy independence. We knew, or at least I thought we knew, when we created the Synthetic Fuels Corporation that the road to commercial development was uncertain and likely to be expensive. We also knew, however, that when they were needed, synthetic fuels would look like a bargain at any cost. When synthetic fuels are needed, they are going to be needed in quantities approaching the 2 million barrels per day of production capacity which the Synthetic Fuels Corporation was charged with establishing. We simply will not have the time to build the plants necessary to produce synthetic fuels in those quantities, if we wait until a time of crisis to get started. You can do all of the research you want, and do small demonstration projects until there is not enough warehouse space at the Department of Energy to store them all, but if the necessary synthetic fuels plants are not in operation when the next crunch comes, all of the fancy blueprints, and academic treaties we will have purchased with the kind of program envisioned in the energy and commerce bill will be of little comfort.

It remains incumbent on this Congress to encourage the development of those alternative fuels on which our Nation's future will depend. Synthetic fuels are those alternatives and we dare not allow a complacency brought on by a temporary oil glut, to make us lose sight of the need to have them available when they are needed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will state that the time of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. QUILLEN] has expired, and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Frost] has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. LaFalce], whose subcommittee has jurisdiction over this matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York [Mr. LaFalce] is recognized for 2 minutes to close debate.

Mr. LaFalce. Mr. Speaker, obviously a great many Members of this body want to vote on the continued existence or not of the Synthetic Fuels Corporation. They will get that opportunity, but I do not think they ought to get that opportunity on the Interior appropriations bill.

My Subcommittee on Economic Stabilization has jurisdiction over the issue. We will have hearings on it immediately after we return from the August recess. I hope to report a bill out in the middle of September so that the Science and Technology Committee can then take it up and Members

can discuss the merits of the Synthetic Fuels Corporation and the merits of the approach we should take toward energy independence after full authorizing committee deliberations.

On the merits of the issue right now, I would point out, too, that this body did in August 1984 take dramatic action. We virtually cut in half the amount of money available to the Synthetic Fuels Corporation, and we totally changed its board of directors. They have had virtually no opportunity to carry out the will of this Congress now, and yet the members of the Synthetic Fuels Corporation's board of directors and its officers right now are those individuals who, either when they were here or on the outside, did not even favor the creation of the Synthetic Fuels Corporation. So we do not have an unfriendly audience running this Synthetic Fuels Corporation now. Those who would abolish it have a friendly board of directors and a friendly group of officers.

Mr. Speaker, this is an inopportune time to act. It is too precipitous, and we will have another opportunity. We will have another opportunity very shortly after we return from the August recess. I urge a "yes" vote on the rule.

● Mr. SYNAR. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to the proposed rule. I do so reluctantly because I have great respect for the chairman and the committee. But as I did almost a year ago to the day, I stand in opposition to this rule; I stand in opposition to the most wasteful and unproductive agency in the Federal Government today—the Synthetic Fuels Corporation. We must put an end to the Synthetic Fuels Corporation now and, to do so, we must defeat this rule.

We will hear today about this Nation's continued vulnerability to foreign oil dependence and the need to remain committed to pursuing energy security. The issue before us today, however, is not simply an issue of energy security. It is an issue of how we as a Nation can achieve energy security in the most productive manner at the lowest possible cost to the taxpayer. The question is not whether we need an energy insurance policy, the question is what kind of coverage that policy provides and how much that policy costs.

If you consider nothing else today, I urge you to go beyond the traditional rhetoric surrounding this debate, beyond the image of the ayatollah, beyond the image of Persian Gulf strife, and focus on the substance of this program—the projects themselves. It's the projects that make the program.

As chairman of the Government Operations Subcommittee with responsibility for overseeing the Synfuels Corporation, I have followed as closely as any Member of Congress the trials and

tribulations of this program and the projects it has brought us. This program has brought us the Union Oil shale facility in Colorado which, after 20 months of unsuccessful startup attempts, remains crippled by the technological difficulties inherent in the premature commercialization of infant technologies. This program has brought us the Great Plains project which remains continually dependent upon forever increasing taxpayer subsidies. I urge my colleagues to look at where we have been with this program and where we are going. Because even as we debate the wisdom of this program today, the Synfuels Corporation continues to negotiate additional assistance for the Union Oil shale facility and more subsidies for the Great Plains project. The past has clearly evidenced the failure of this program. The future promises only the disastrous consequences of our failure to act today.

As we debate the future of this program, our colleagues in the budget conference continue to struggle with ever-increasing deficits which truly threaten the security and prosperity of this Nation. Since we debated this program last year, the deficit has become larger, the prospects for substantial long-term deficit reduction have become dimmer and the expectations of synfuels viability have become more distant.

The real question before us today is a question of priorities and equity. It is a question of whether we as a Congress are prepared to say no to the family farmer, not to the elderly, no to the hungry and the homeless and yes to the handful of multimillion- and billion-dollar corporations that want Uncle Sam to pay their way to greater profits. It is a question of whether we as a Congress are committed to getting serious about this Nation's deficit problems and doing so in a fair and equitable manner.

Mr. Speaker, there are those who ask why we must act now. Just last week, the Synthetic Fuels Corporation reached preliminary agreement to provide an additional \$720 million in taxpayer subsidies to the Great Plains project. We may not be able to alter that decision. But, Mr. Speaker, the Great Plains story is the story of the Synfuels Corporation. It is a story of technologies which cannot and will not for the foreseeable future be able to compete in the marketplace. It is a story of sponsors returning time and time again for more and more of the taxpayers' money. It is a story to which we must now write an end. We must cut our losses before it's too late. I urge my colleagues to vote no on the rule and support the efforts of myself and my colleagues to put an end to the Synthetic Fuels Corporation. ●

□ 1330

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time has expired.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. SYNAR. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 179, nays 251, not voting 3, as follows:

(Roll No. 252)

YEAS—179

Addabbo	Gray (IL)	Ortiz
Akaka	Gray (PA)	Owens
Alexander	Grotberg	Packard
Anderson	Hall (OH)	Pease
Andrews	Hall, Ralph	Pepper
Annunzio	Hamilton	Perkins
Applegate	Hatcher	Pickle
Aspin	Hawkins	Price
Atkins	Hayes	Quillen
Bateman	Hendon	Rahall
Beilenson	Horton	Rangel
Bennett	Howard	Regula
Bevill	Hoyer	Reid
Boggs	Hubbard	Robinson
Boland	Hutto	Roe
Boner (TN)	Hyde	Rogers
Bonior (MI)	Jenkins	Rose
Borski	Jones (NC)	Rostenkowski
Boucher	Kanjorski	Roybal
Brooks	Kildee	Rudd
Brown (CO)	Kolter	Russo
Bruce	Kramer	Sabo
Bryant	LaFalce	Schaefer
Burton (CA)	Lantos	Scheuer
Bustamante	Leath (TX)	Schulze
Byron	Lehman (CA)	Seiberling
Carr	Lehman (FL)	Shelby
Chappell	Leland	Shuster
Clinger	Levine (CA)	Skeen
Coelho	Lipinski	Skelton
Coleman (TX)	Lloyd	Smith (IA)
Coyne	Long	Snowe
Daniel	Lowery (CA)	Snyder
Dannemeyer	Lujan	Staggers
de la Garza	Lundine	Stangeland
Derrick	Manton	Stenholm
Dicks	Matsui	Stokes
Dixon	Mavroules	Strang
Donnelly	McDade	Stratton
Dorgan (ND)	McKernan	Trafigant
Duncan	McKinney	Traxler
Durbin	Mica	Udall
Dwyer	Michel	Valentine
Early	Miller (OH)	Visclosky
Edwards (CA)	Mineta	Volkmer
Emerson	Moakley	Walgren
Fascell	Mollohan	Watkins
Fazio	Montgomery	Wheat
Foley	Moody	Whitley
Ford (TN)	Murphy	Whitten
Frost	Murtha	Wilson
Fuqua	Myers	Wirth
Garcia	Natcher	Wise
Gaydos	Nelson	Wright
Gekas	Nichols	Wyllie
Gibbons	Nielsen	Yates
Gilman	Nowak	Yatron
Gonzalez	O'Brien	Young (AK)
Goodling	Oakar	Young (MO)
Gordon	Oberstar	

NAYS—251

Ackerman	Franklin	Obey
Anthony	Frenzel	Olin
Archer	Gallo	Oxley
Armey	Gedensson	Panetta
AuCoin	Gephardt	Parris
Badham	Gingrich	Pashayan
Barnard	Glickman	Penny
Barnes	Gradison	Petri
Bartlett	Green	Porter
Barton	Gregg	Pursell
Bates	Guarini	Ray
Bedell	Gunderson	Richardson
Bentley	Hammerschmidt	Ridge
Bereuter	Hansen	Rinaldo
Berman	Hartnett	Ritter
Biaggi	Heftel	Roberts
Billrakis	Henry	Rodino
Biiley	Hertel	Roemer
Boehlert	Hiler	Roth
Bonker	Hillis	Roukema
Bosco	Holt	Rowland (CT)
Boulter	Hopkins	Rowland (GA)
Boxer	Huckaby	Savage
Breaux	Hughes	Saxton
Broomfield	Hunter	Schneider
Brown (CA)	Ireland	Schroeder
Broyhill	Jacobs	Schuetz
Burton (IN)	Jeffords	Schumer
Callahan	Johnson	Sensenbrenner
Campbell	Jones (OK)	Sharp
Carney	Jones (TN)	Shaw
Carper	Kaptur	Shumway
Chandler	Kasich	Sikorski
Chappie	Kastenmeier	Siljander
Cheney	Kemp	Sisk
Clay	Kennelly	Slattery
Coats	Kindness	Slaughter
Cobey	Kleczka	Smith (FL)
Coble	Kolbe	Smith (NE)
Coleman (MO)	Kostmayer	Smith (NH)
Collins	Lagomarsino	Smith (NJ)
Combest	Latta	Smith, Denny
Conte	Leach (IA)	Smith, Robert
Conyers	Lent	Solarz
Cooper	Levin (MI)	Solomon
Coughlin	Lewis (CA)	Spence
Courter	Lewis (FL)	Spratt
Craig	Lightfoot	St Germain
Crane	Livingston	Stallings
Crockett	Loeffler	Stark
Darden	Lott	Studds
Daschle	Lowry (WA)	Stump
Daub	Lukens	Sundquist
Davis	Lungren	Sweeney
DeLay	Mack	Swift
Dellums	MacKay	Swindall
DeWine	Madigan	Synar
Dickinson	Markey	Tallon
Dingell	Marlenee	Tauke
DioGuardi	Martin (IL)	Tauzin
Dornan (CA)	Martin (NY)	Taylor
Dowdy	Martinez	Thomas (CA)
Dreier	Mazzoli	Thomas (GA)
Dymally	McCain	Torres
Dyson	McCandless	Torricelli
Eckart (OH)	McCloskey	Towns
Eckert (NY)	McCollum	Vander Jagt
Edgar	McCurdy	Vento
Edwards (OK)	McEwen	Vucanovich
English	McGrath	Walker
Erdreich	McHugh	Waxman
Evans (IA)	McMillan	Weaver
Evans (IL)	Meyers	Weber
Fawell	Mikulski	Weiss
Feighan	Miller (CA)	Whitehurst
Fiedler	Miller (WA)	Whittaker
Fields	Mitchell	Williams
Fish	Molinar	Wolf
Flippo	Moore	Wolpe
Florio	Moorhead	Wortley
Foglietta	Morrison (CT)	Wyden
Ford (MI)	Morrison (WA)	Young (FL)
Fowler	Mrazek	Zschau
Frank	Neal	

NOT VOTING—3

Downey	Hefner	Monson
--------	--------	--------

□ 1340

Messrs. SILJANDER, JONES of Tennessee, EDWARDS of Oklahoma, SMITH of Florida, STARK, PANET-

TA, FOGLIETTA, and BADHAM changed their votes from "yea" to "nay."

So the resolution was not agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

□ 1350

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on House Resolution 227.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

WAIVING CERTAIN POINTS OF ORDER AGAINST CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3038 DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT-INDEPENDENT AGENCIES APPROPRIATION ACT, 1986

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 233 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 233

Resolved, That during the consideration of the bill (H.R. 3038) making appropriations for the Department of Housing and Urban Development, and for sundry independent agencies, boards, commissions, corporations, and offices for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1986, and for other purposes, all points of order against the following provisions in the bill for failure to comply with the provisions of clause 2 of rule XXI are hereby waived: beginning on page 2, line 8 through page 7, line 17; beginning on page 8, line 4 through page 10, line 8; beginning on page 10, line 22 through 25; beginning on page 11, line 7 through page 12, line 13; beginning on page 12, line 20 through page 13, line 6; beginning on page 14, lines 12 through 21; beginning on page 15, line 13 through page 17, line 7; beginning on page 18, line 10 through page 23, line 18; beginning on page 24, line 14 through page 27, line 21; beginning on page 28, line 4 through page 31, line 16; beginning on page 35, line 11 through page 37, line 26; and beginning on page 38, line 22 through page 40, line 2; and all points of order against the following provisions in the bill for failure to comply with the provisions of clause 6 of rule XXI are hereby waived: beginning on page 2, line 8 through page 5, line 19; beginning on page 8, lines 4 through 18; beginning on page 11, lines 7 through 16; beginning on page 37, lines 7 through 26; beginning on page 39, lines 10 through 22; and beginning on page 40, lines 4 through 13.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MOAKLEY] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield the customary 30 minutes for purposes of debate only to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. QUILLLEN], pending

which I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 233 waives points of order against a number of provisions of H.R. 3038, the Department of Housing and Urban Development and Independent Agencies Appropriations Act for Fiscal Year 1986. The rule does not provide for the bill's consideration since general appropriation bills are privileged under the Rules of the House. Provisions relating to time for general debate are also excluded from the rule. Customarily, general debate is limited by a unanimous-consent request by the chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee, Mr. BOLAND, prior to consideration of the bill.

Mr. Speaker, despite the fact that the House and Senate have not agreed to a budget resolution for fiscal year 1986, no Budget Act waiver is necessary to the consideration of this appropriation bill. As Members are aware, earlier today, the House adopted House Resolution 231 which deemed the House-passed budget resolution to have been adopted for purposes of the enforcement provisions of the Budget Act. This allows the House to proceed to consideration of appropriations and other spending legislation without the necessity of a waiver of section 303(a) of the Budget Act. This and other legislation is subject to all the other constraints of the Budget Act.

House Resolution 233 waives clause 2, of rule XXI which prohibits unauthorized appropriations and legislative provisions in general appropriation bills, against specified provisions in the bill. House Resolution 233 also waives clause 6, of rule XXI which prohibits reappropriations or transfers in general appropriation bills, against specified provisions in the bill. Mr. Speaker, the specific provisions of the bill which have been protected by these waivers are detailed in the rule, by reference to page and line of the Housing and Urban Development Appropriation bill. Chairman WHITTEN has also written a letter describing the provisions protected by the waivers. The provisions described in the letter are the only ones that waivers are provided for.

The provisions granted a waiver of clause 2, rule XXI in title I of H.R. 3038 provide appropriations for a number of programs of the Department of Housing and Urban Development. The waivers are necessary for some provisions because, while authorizing legislation for the programs involved is under consideration at some stage of the legislative process, it has not yet been enacted into law. In addition, Mr. Speaker, several provisions violate the prohibition on legislation in general appropriation bills, although a number of these are similar

to language routinely included in previous appropriation acts. These programs include housing for the elderly and handicapped. Low-income housing projects, and community development grants.

Clause 2, rule XXI waivers are also necessary to allow consideration of appropriations items in title II of the bill which fund the following independent agencies: The Consumer Product Safety Commission; the Environmental Protection Agency; Federal Emergency Management Agency; NASA; the National Science Foundation; the Neighborhood Reinvestment Corporation, and the Veterans' Administration.

The waivers of clause 6, rule XXI are provided for portions of the bill which provide for continued availability and use of funds provided in prior appropriations, for such programs as the troubled projects operating subsidy, the loan guaranty revolving fund, and the Veterans' Administration. The waivers are necessary to allow consideration of these reappropriations.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 3038 appropriates \$57.8 billion in new budget authority for the Housing and Urban Development Department and 17 independent agencies in fiscal year 1986. The bill would provide \$12.6 billion for federally assisted housing programs, \$330 million for urban development action grants, \$1.5 billion for the Environmental Protection Agency, \$7.7 billion for NASA, \$3.4 billion for revenue sharing, and \$26.5 billion for the Veterans' Administration. In addition, H.R. 3038 appropriates \$2.0 billion for the construction of 10,000 much needed public housing units. Also, H.R. 3038 would require that the Housing and Urban Development Department make available up to 20 percent of public housing funds earmarked for the development or acquisition of public housing for major reconstruction of obsolete housing projects.

Mr. Speaker, this is an important measure providing for new budget authority for a wide variety of programs and agencies. The Appropriations Committee should be commended for acting on a very important and complex bill and for reporting a bill that comes within the guidelines of the House-passed budget resolution. In addition, I would like to commend the gentleman from Massachusetts, the chairman of the HUD-Independent Agencies Subcommittee, Mr. BOLAND, for his hard work and leadership in dealing with issues that are vital to the Federal Government and the American people. I urge the Members to adopt the resolution.

□ 1400

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the rule has been ably explained by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MOAKLEY].

This is an important appropriation bill. Not only does it include HUD but also 16 independent agencies including the Veterans' Administration. We know that the veterans of this country deserve every attention possible that we can give them, as do the elderly, as do the needy, as do the beneficiaries of many of these agencies for which funds are appropriated in this bill.

So, Mr. Speaker, even though the administration says this bill is above their request, the committee reports that it is \$1 billion less than 1985 and the rule needs to be adopted.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER].

Mr. WALKER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, this bill and this rule are basically the kind of bill and rule that we have considered on the House floor before. I went to the Rules Committee, though, yesterday, with a subject area that I thought needed to be addressed and which did not get addressed in the Rules Committee; and I thought that I would bring it up because ultimately we are going to resolve it on the floor.

I have talked to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BOLAND] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. GREEN], and when the bill comes to the floor, I will be offering an amendment which I think they are prepared to take at that point.

I wanted to raise the issue of what I brought before the Rules Committee yesterday, because I think it is a question of process that needs to be understood by the House.

Back some weeks ago we passed a shuttle pricing policy on the House floor. It was a relatively close vote, but it was rather intensely debated and we came to a conclusion about shuttle pricing policy.

In the appropriations bill as reported from committee, the Appropriations Committee had gone back to the shuttle pricing policy that was rejected by the House, and put that in as a legislative provision in the appropriations bill.

It was my opinion, and when I appeared before the Rules Committee yesterday, that that kind of legislating in an appropriations bill ought to at least be subject to a point of order on the House floor; that we ought not be waiving points of order where the House itself has made a specific decision.

It is one thing to talk about waiving authorization types of language where in fact the authorizing committees have not done their job. I have some questions about that, and I can understand how Members can have some concern about that.

In this case, the authorizing committee had not only done its job; we had come to the floor, we had specifically debated the issue, the House had determined the issue; it is an issue where the Senate has already passed the bill; we are about to go to conference and we were faced here with a legislative provision in an appropriations bill that would have a marked effect on that policy.

It seemed to me that the Rules Committee, in those kinds of instances, does have an obligation to make that kind of legislation in an appropriation bill subject to a point of order.

The Rules Committee, in this rule, specifically decided not to do that, and I raise it as an issue because it would cause me to vote against the rule, but I think we also ought to take a look at the process, that it seems to me that the Rules Committee ought not put this House in a position of having legislation in an appropriation bill where the House has previously made a very, very fundamental determination, and I would hope that in the future the Rules Committee would be a little more sympathetic to those of us who sit for hours and hours and hours in authorizing committees to make decisions, who bring the bills in good conscience to the House floor, make decisions, and then have the potential of those decisions being overridden with legislation in an appropriations bill.

That is specifically what the rules attempt to protect, and what was being violated here, and I am disappointed that the Rules Committee did not see fit to maintain the point of order.

As I say, in discussions that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BOLAND], the gentleman from New York [Mr. GREEN] have had with the chairman of the authorizing committee, with the chairman of the subcommittee, with myself, and so, on, I think we have come to an agreement now that that ought not be the way of proceeding, and that the motion to strike I hope will be accepted; but it does bother me.

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BARTLETT].

Mr. BARTLETT. I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I rise to oppose the rule that is now before us, as I will be opposing the bill itself.

What is essentially wrong with the rule is the rule would waive a number of points of order against the bill; those points of order not being trivial, but being significant to this bill.

The most important of which is the bill would waive the point of order in which programs that are not yet authorized would be appropriated.

Now in many appropriations bills, this happens, and I suppose that is a common bills, this happens, and I sup-

pose that is a common fight or disagreement on the floor in appropriating funds for programs that are not yet authorized.

I wish to bring to the House's attention that this bill goes a substantial step further than that; this bill appropriates \$500 million in the assisted housing category for what is euphemistically called new program reserve.

This bill would appropriate \$500 million for programs that are not only not authorized, but have never been authorized; that have never existed, that may or may not ever exist.

My point is that the point of order should not be waived on brand new programs that have never been created, and should not be waived on unauthorized programs that are waiting to be authorized in the first place.

I think it sets an enormously difficult and bad precedent for this House to be appropriating funds for new programs that had never existed.

Now, assuming the rule passes, and when we get to the appropriations bill, I will be offering an amendment to delete that new program reserve; that slush fund, if you will, of some \$500 million that appropriates funds for new programs. I would urge the Appropriations Committee and the authorizing committee on which I serve to go back to the drawing board and we can then decide whether we want to authorize these new programs, and if we do, and if the Congress authorizes the new programs, then we can come back on either a supplemental or a rescission or a new appropriations bill, and appropriate the funds after the authorization.

Now there is a further difficulty with the bill that this rule makes in order. The difficulty is, the appropriations bill is sold as a freeze level bill in the assisted housing programs, but in the assisted housing programs it appears to be, when you begin to look at each program line by line, a total increase in expenditures over fiscal year 1985 expenditures of a total of \$1.7 billion.

When we get to the House floor on the bill itself, I will take time to offer amendments, and in debate I will explain to the House how that \$1.7 billion was added on.

Suffice it to say for now that it was done in two ways: One, with an accounting change which made a change in accounting which changed \$989 million; set that off-budget, or outside the HUD appropriations process, and then spent the money on new and additional programs.

The other way was to take \$800 million of a nonrecurring, one-time-only program that was spent and designed to be spent only in fiscal year 1985; it is called rent supplement wrap; the program was not terminated; was not eliminated; it just simply existed for 1 year.

We took that \$800 million and we spent that money additionally in fiscal year 1986 as if it were an ongoing program.

So I will have three amendments: One, to reduce the number of units of newly constructed public housing units from the 10,000 units that are in the bill back to a freeze level of 5,000 new units that we built in fiscal year 1985. I will not be proposing that we terminate public housing or that we eliminate all new units of public housing; but merely that we build the same number of new units in 1986 than we built in 1985.

The second one will be to eliminate the program reserve of new, unauthorized programs.

The third, then, will be across-the-board reduction of 2½ percent in order to achieve a true freeze level in the assisted housing programs.

I would call my colleagues' attention that the assisted housing programs will be the first up on the calendar; that in the HUD appropriations bill, the very first area that we will debate will be the HUD assisted housing programs; it is the area that is on a percentage basis the largest out of line in terms of a freeze.

□ 1410

It does spend a total of \$1.7 billion more in fiscal year 1986 than we spent in fiscal year 1985. I would urge my colleagues to vote no on the rule so we can go back for a better rule so the points of order against appropriating funds for programs that are not yet and have never been authorized will simply not be in there and that we would be allowed to make a point of order in that case.

I would urge a "no" vote on the rule.

Mr. QUILLEN. Mrs. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. GREEN] to close debate on this side.

Mr. GREEN. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote for the rule. I shall address the points that the gentleman from Texas has made with respect to the substance of the bill when we go into the Committee of the Whole House and debate the bill.

With respect to the rule, point out that inevitably with this bill we come to the Rules Committee at a time when the majority of the programs in the bill are not authorized. I wish it were not so. The chairman of the subcommittee wishes it were not so. But that is the fact, and year after year it has been the fact, and year after year, if the House wants to proceed expeditiously with the appropriations bills instead of doing them all in the form of a continuing resolution, we have to have this kind of a solution.

The reserve to which my friend from Texas refers is a device we have used

in the past to account to this House for the fact that we can expect further requests for funds for these programs, so that the House will be put on notice and know at the time it is considering this bill what it can expect in the way of spending, and so that it is not surprised by a supplemental request or funding in a continuing resolution. I think it is the more honest way to do it rather than just pretending that the future spending does not exist as a problem for the future.

So I would urge my colleagues to vote for this rule and let us move on to the substance of the bill.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I understand the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. QUILLEN] has no further requests for time. I have no further requests for time.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 266, nays 159, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 253]

YEAS—266

Ackerman	Carper	Fish
Addabbo	Carr	Flippo
Akaka	Chappell	Florio
Alexander	Clay	Foglietta
Anderson	Coelho	Foley
Andrews	Coleman (TX)	Ford (MI)
Annunzio	Collins	Ford (TN)
Anthony	Conte	Fowler
Applegate	Conyers	Frank
Aspin	Cooper	Franklin
Atkins	Coughlin	Frost
AuCoin	Coyne	Fuqua
Barnard	Crockett	Garcia
Barnes	Darden	Gaydos
Bateman	Daschle	Gejdenson
Bates	Davis	Gephardt
Bedell	de la Garza	Gibbons
Beilenson	Dellums	Gillman
Bennett	Derrick	Glickman
Berman	Dicks	Gonzalez
Bevill	Dingell	Gordon
Biaggi	Dixon	Gradison
Boehlert	Donnelly	Gray (IL)
Boggs	Dorgan (ND)	Gray (PA)
Boland	Dowdy	Green
Boner (TN)	Duncan	Guarini
Bonior (MI)	Durbin	Hall (OH)
Bonker	Dwyer	Hamilton
Borski	Dymally	Hatcher
Bosco	Dyson	Hayes
Boucher	Early	Hertel
Boxer	Eckart (OH)	Hillis
Breaux	Edgar	Howard
Brooks	Edwards (CA)	Hoyer
Brown (CA)	English	Hutto
Bruce	Erdreich	Hyde
Bryant	Evans (IL)	Jacobs
Burton (CA)	Fascell	Jenkins
Bustamante	Fazio	Jones (NC)
Byron	Feighan	Jones (OK)

Jones (TN)	Murtha	Slattery
Kanjorski	Myers	Smith (FL)
Kaptur	Natcher	Smith (IA)
Kastenmeier	Neal	Smith (NE)
Kennelly	Nelson	Smith (NJ)
Kildee	Nichols	Snyder
Kleczka	Nowak	Solarz
Kolter	O'Brien	Spratt
Kostmayer	Oakar	St Germain
LaFalce	Oberstar	Staggers
Lantos	Obey	Stallings
Lehman (CA)	Olin	Stark
Lehman (FL)	Ortiz	Stokes
Leland	Owens	Stratton
Levin (MI)	Panetta	Studds
Levine (CA)	Pease	Swift
Lipinski	Perkins	Synar
Lloyd	Pickle	Tallion
Long	Price	Thomas (GA)
Lowery (CA)	Pursell	Torres
Lowry (WA)	Quillen	Torricelli
Lujan	Rahall	Towns
Luken	Rangel	Trafficant
Lundine	Ray	Traxler
MacKay	Regula	Udall
Manton	Reid	Valentine
Markey	Richardson	Vento
Martinez	Ridge	Visclosky
Matsui	Rinaldo	Volkmer
Mavroules	Robinson	Walgren
Mazzoli	Rodino	Watkins
McCloskey	Roe	Waxman
McCurdy	Rose	Weaver
McDade	Rostenkowski	Weiss
McHugh	Rowland (GA)	Wheat
McKinney	Roybal	Whitley
Mica	Russo	Whitten
Mikulski	Sabo	Wilson
Miller (CA)	Savage	Wirth
Miller (OH)	Scheuer	Wise
Mineta	Schroeder	Wolpe
Mitchell	Schumer	Wortley
Moakley	Seiberling	Wyden
Mollohan	Sharp	Wylie
Montgomery	Shelby	Yates
Moody	Sikorski	Yatron
Morrison (CT)	Sisisky	Young (AK)
Mrazek	Skeen	Young (MO)
Murphy	Skelton	

NAYS—159

Archer	Fields	Madigan
Armey	Frenzel	Marlenee
Badham	Gallo	Martin (IL)
Bartlett	Gekas	Martin (NY)
Barton	Gingrich	McCain
Bentley	Goodling	McCandless
Bereuter	Gregg	McCollum
Billakis	Grothberg	McEwen
Billey	Gunderson	McGrath
Boulter	Hall, Ralph	McKernan
Broomfield	Hammerschmidt	McMillan
Brown (CO)	Hansen	Meyers
Broyhill	Hartnett	Michel
Burton (IN)	Heftel	Miller (WA)
Callahan	Hendon	Molinari
Campbell	Henry	Moore
Carney	Hiler	Moorhead
Chandler	Holt	Morrison (WA)
Chappie	Hopkins	Nielson
Cheney	Hubbard	Oxley
Clinger	Huckaby	Packard
Coats	Hughes	Parris
Cobey	Hunter	Pashayan
Coble	Ireland	Penny
Coleman (MO)	Jeffords	Petri
Combest	Johnson	Porter
Courter	Kasich	Ritter
Craig	Kemp	Roberts
Crane	Kindness	Roemer
Daniel	Kolbe	Rogers
Dannemeyer	Kramer	Roth
Daub	Lagomarsino	Roukema
DeLay	Latta	Rowland (CT)
DeWine	Leach (IA)	Rudd
Dickinson	Leath (TX)	Saxton
DioGuardi	Lent	Schaefer
Dornan (CA)	Lewis (CA)	Schneider
Dreier	Lewis (FL)	Schuetz
Eckert (NY)	Lightfoot	Schulze
Edwards (OK)	Livingston	Sensenbrenner
Emerson	Loeffler	Shaw
Evans (IA)	Lott	Shumway
Fawell	Lungren	Shuster
Fiedler	Mack	Siljander

Slaughter	Strang	Vander Jagt
Smith (NH)	Stump	Vucanovich
Smith, Denny	Sundquist	Walker
Smith, Robert	Sweeney	Weber
Snowe	Swindall	Whitehurst
Solomon	Tauke	Whittaker
Spence	Tauzin	Wolf
Stangeland	Taylor	Young (FL)
Stenholm	Thomas (CA)	Zschau

NOT VOTING—8

Downey	Horton	Williams
Hawkins	Monson	Wright
Hefner	Pepper	

□ 1430

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 821

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my name be removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 821.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the bill, H.R. 3038, and that I be permitted to include tables, charts, and other extraneous material.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT-INDEPENDENT AGENCIES APPROPRIATION ACT, 1986

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 3038) making appropriations for the Department of Housing and Urban Development, and for sundry independent agencies, boards, commissions, corporations, and offices for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1986, and for other purposes; and pending that motion, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate be limited to not to exceed 1 hour, the time to be equally divided and controlled by the gentleman from New York [Mr. GREEN] and myself.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by

the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BOLAND].

The motion was agreed to.

□ 1432

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 3038, with Mr. PANETTA in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Under the unanimous-consent agreement, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BOLAND] will be recognized for 30 minutes and the gentleman from New York [Mr. GREEN] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BOLAND].

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I want to pay tribute to the members of this subcommittee on the majority side, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. TRAXLER], the gentlewoman from Louisiana [Mrs. BOGGS], the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. STOKES], the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. SABO], and the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BONER].

I also want to pay my respects to the ranking minority member, the gentleman from New York [Mr. GREEN], who has had extensive experience in the housing area and with these programs, and also to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. COUGHLIN], and the gentleman from California [Mr. LEWIS].

Mr. Chairman, the 1986 HUD-independent agencies appropriation bill which we bring to the floor today is, for the most part, noncontroversial. The bill, as it is before you, provides \$57,807,514,000 in new budget authority for 1986. That is \$10,351,783,000 above the President's request and is \$1,011,043,000 below 1985. And, Mr. Chairman, virtually all of the increase above the President's budget is once again in the subsidized housing programs. Also, Mr. Chairman, the bill is within the \$42,500,000,000 of tentative section 302(b) allocation—based on the House-passed budget resolution.

One thing I should point out at the outset is that the numbers I just gave you do not include \$3,310,000,000 of budget authority we deferred pending enactment of three authorizations. We have deferred \$900,000,000 for the Superfund Program—\$2,400,000,000 for the Construction Grants Program—and \$10,000,000 for a new fair housing initiative under HUD. However, all of the \$3,310,000,000 is assumed within the section 302(b) allocations.

Now as I said, we are \$10.3 billion over the President's budget. That is a lot of money—but let's keep in mind two things.

First, the President's budget included no funds for the Subsidized Housing Program. After the budget came up in February—everyone recognized that was simply not equitable. So both budget committees have assumed roughly \$10 to \$11.5 billion of new budget authority for new subsidized housing.

And the second point, is to keep in mind that under these programs we score the budget authority for the entire period of the housing contract. That means that the \$10.7 billion in this bill covers 15 or 20 or even 30 years of the cost of each housing unit. So our method of scoring these costs tends to magnify the budget authority numbers.

HOUSING

Pages 4 through 8 of the report describe the subcommittee's actions concerning subsidized housing. Basically, we have included 100,000 incremental housing units in this bill. By incremental, I mean a net addition of subsidized housing units to the total number of 3.9 million currently under subsidy.

We have provided for 10,000 new public housing units—30,000 section 8 voucher units—12,000 section 202 housing for the elderly units—1,000 Indian housing units—32,000 section 8 existing units—and 15,000 section 8 moderate rehabilitation units. All of that adds to 100,000 incremental housing units.

In addition, we have also included \$150 million to provide for approximately 15,000 rental rehabilitation units and 2,500 rental development [HODAG] units.

Finally, in the housing area, as many of you know, the House Banking Committee recently reported H.R. 1, the housing authorization bill for fiscal years 1986 and 1987. That bill has in it a number of potential new programmatic thrusts which are not addressed in this appropriation. So what we have done is exactly what we did 2 years ago—and that is that we have set aside \$500 million in a reserve to accommodate at least some of new programmatic thrusts contained in H.R. 1—if that bill is ultimately passed and signed by the President.

Under the Community Development Block Program—we are going along with the 10 percent reduction proposed by the President and assumed in the budget resolution. For the Urban Development Action Grant Program we are recommending a 25-percent cut—from \$440 million made available in 1985 to \$330 million in 1986. I should point out, in the house budget resolution a 10-percent reduction was assumed and in the Senate a 20-percent cut was included. We are below both resolutions.

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

For the Environmental Protection Agency, the total increase recommend-

ed above the budget request is \$128 million. Also, we are about \$174 million above the current 1985 rate. That increase above the budget request of \$128 million is made up of \$62 million in the operating programs—\$16 million to restore the 5-percent pay cut—and \$50 million for the school asbestos program. Except for the asbestos funds, the add-ons for EPA are largely in areas that the committee has restored funding for in the past.

FEDERAL EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT AGENCY

For FEMA, we have included funding in the bill that puts us about \$70 million above 1985 and about \$89.6 million above the budget request. I should quickly point out that the bulk of that increase above the budget and above 1985 is made up of \$70 million included for the Emergency Food and Shelter Program. That activity has been underway since 1983, and to date we have made available a total of \$160 million through the national board and \$50 million through the States.

In other FEMA activities, the report spells out in great detail the committee's problems with the Agency in connection with discrepancies in the budget justifications. We have tried to address these ongoing management problems by including very specific bill and report language that will put FEMA on notice that we expect that Agency to provide the Congress with honest budget estimates.

Also, for FEMA, we have added about \$22 million for the Civil Defense Program. You may recall that during the past 3 or 4 years the Agency has requested substantial increases for civil defense. Virtually all of those increases have been denied in the past. However, in 1986 the President's budget proposed a decrease in the Civil Defense Program below the 1985 level. While we are in agreement with the general philosophy of that decrease—we felt it went a little too far and we have restored some funding for ongoing civil defense grants to States. In 1987, we expect that the States will take over some of these programs on a 50/50 matching basis.

NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION

For NASA we have recommended a total of \$7,666,000,000 and that is \$220 million under the President's budget request. It is, however, about \$175 million above the current 1985 level. We have been able to provide for that small add-on above 1985 by reallocating some of our tentative section 302(b) allocation.

Now in taking a \$220 million cut from the President's budget—what we tried to do was to adopt the philosophy that these reductions should be handled in such a way as to preserve the funding stream for those projects already underway—and cut to those projects which are proposed as essentially new starts in 1986.

We took that approach because it makes the most sense. Why? Because if additional projects are started in 1986 that will require substantially increased funding in 1987 and 1988—NASA's problems in view of upcoming very tight budgets will only get worse.

So we took the reductions primarily from the orbital maneuvering vehicle—which we cut from \$25 million to \$10 million—the solar optical telescope—which we cut from \$30 million to \$5 million—and the scatterometer—which we cut from \$31 million to \$6 million. And, we felt we could take some money out of the space station—which is basically a new activity—and we reduced that from \$230 million to \$200 million.

Let me give you a little additional insight as to why we took the approach we did. It's always easy to start new projects at low funding levels. We could probably have started the solar optical telescope with \$10 or \$15 million. But to do that, we would have had to cut some other ongoing project. For example, the Senate Authorization Committee, in making its reductions, reduced the upper atmospheric research satellite by \$20 million in 1986—from \$134 million to \$114 million.

But do you know what the impact of that reduction is? The upper atmospheric research satellite—which is a satellite designed to take a hard look at what's happening to our atmosphere—and which is scheduled to fly in 1988 or 1989—is in its third year of funding. That \$20 million cut will require NASA to replace it with \$56 million in 1987 and 1988. So we only cut the project by \$5 million—because the fact is that it doesn't make any sense to cut programs that are in the middle of their major funding stream and end up having it cost NASA three or four times as much. It makes a lot more sense to cut programs that are just about ready to start.

So that is the philosophy we followed with NASA—and I think it makes sense—and I think that the agency basically agrees with what we have done—given the very tough budget problems.

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

For the Veterans' Administration, we have added a total of \$441,802,000. But, let me quickly point out that \$205 million of that add-on was to restore the 5-percent pay cut.

And by the way, while I'm on that subject, I think this subcommittee should be commended for the fact that we took it upon ourselves to use part of our section 302 (b) allocation to restore more than \$300 million for the 5-percent pay cut. Other subcommittees will have to face that problem down the road—or they will pass it off on a supplemental bill. But for every major agency in this bill we have re-

stored the 5-percent cut. So, we are \$441 million over the President's budget in the table. However, because we have recently received a budget amendment from the President restoring the 5-percent pay cut to all agencies, our amount over the President's budget will ultimately be reduced by over \$200 million.

Without restoring that pay cut to the VA Medical Programs—the 172 hospitals would face disaster. You cannot run a medical care system that has 193,000 employees—and not have sufficient funds to pay the people. We would have lost 5,000 additional nurses and doctors and lab technicians, et cetera—unless we had restored that pay cut at the beginning of the fiscal year.

We have also added about \$80 million to maintain the 1985 FTEE [full time equivalent employment level] at 193,941. With new facilities coming

online, even maintaining the level of nurses and doctors et cetera, at the 1985 rate will cause nearly every VA Hospital to give up positions in order to staff the new facilities.

The other major add-on in VA comes in the construction program where we have added a net of \$98,960,000. Now let me quickly point out that we have not added any additional projects for construction. No, what we are trying to do is save OMB and the VA from itself. They proposed partial funding for the Philadelphia and Houston hospitals. This subcommittee has long had a policy that every construction project should be submitted for full funding. This is the first year, in my memory, that the administration did not do that. We have elected to add money to restore both the Philadelphia and Houston hospitals to the full funding level.

□ 1440

Now we have taken some offsets to do that. We cut out a couple of parking garages and a cemetery in northern California. And by the way, although those are virtually the only reductions we have made in the entire bill, from what we have heard, you would almost think that they were the most vital part of this legislation. But, basically, we have judged the parking garages at a lower priority than treating patients.

So Mr. Chairman, that sums up the HUD-independent agencies appropriation bill. I think it is a responsible mark. I think it is reasonable, and I hope it has your support. I will include a table summarizing the amounts recommended in the bill with comparisons to the 1985 appropriations and the 1986 budget requests at this point.

SUMMARY OF ESTIMATES AND NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY IN BILL

Department or agency (1)	Appropriations, 1985 (2)	Budget estimates, 1986 (3)	Recommended in bill (4)	Bill compared with—	
				Appropriations, 1985 (5)	Budget estimates, 1986 (6)
American Battle Monuments Commission	\$11,065,000	\$10,954,000	\$10,954,000	—\$111,000	
Cemeterial Expenses, Army	7,759,000	14,778,000	7,759,000		—\$7,019,000
Consumer Information Center	1,149,000	1,249,000	1,249,000	+100,000	
Consumer Product Safety Commission	36,000,000	33,700,000	37,000,000	+1,000,000	+3,300,000
Council on Environmental Quality	700,000	705,000	700,000		—5,000
Department of Housing and Urban Development	16,901,317,775	5,088,041,000	16,445,549,781	—455,767,994	+11,357,508,781
Environmental Protection Agency	1,321,775,000	1,367,596,000	1,496,176,000	+174,401,000	+128,580,000
Federal Emergency Management Agency	561,388,000	542,070,000	631,656,000	+70,288,000	+89,586,000
Federal Home Loan Bank Board ¹	(68,908,000)	(71,649,000)	(27,617,000)	(—41,291,000)	(—44,032,000)
National Aeronautics and Space Administration	7,491,400,000	7,886,000,000	7,666,000,000	+174,600,000	—220,000,000
National Credit Union Administration ²	(600,000,000)	(600,000,000)	(600,000,000)		
National Science Foundation	1,501,792,000	1,569,400,000	1,523,855,000	+22,063,000	—45,545,000
Neighborhood Reinvestment Corporation	15,512,000	14,669,000	17,669,000	+2,157,000	+3,000,000
Office of Consumer Affairs	2,096,000	1,988,000	1,988,000		—108,000
Office of Revenue Sharing	4,874,641,000	4,574,485,000	3,433,025,000	—1,441,616,000	—1,141,460,000
Office of Science and Technology Policy	2,194,000	2,091,000	2,343,000	+149,000	+252,000
Selective Service System	27,780,000	27,384,000	27,780,000		+396,000
Veterans Administration	26,062,008,000	26,320,621,000	26,503,810,000	+441,802,000	+183,189,000
Total	58,818,556,775	47,455,731,000	57,807,513,781	—1,011,042,994	+10,351,782,781

¹ Limitation on corporate funds; administrative and nonadministrative expenses in 1985 and only administrative expenses in 1986.

² Limitation on direct loans.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to join the distinguished chairman of the HUD-Independent Agencies Appropriations Subcommittee in commending our colleagues on the subcommittee for their contributions to this bill. In addition, I would particularly like to express my appreciation and, I hope, the appreciation of the House to the distinguished chairman for the remarkable job that he does in bringing this bill to the floor of the House.

This is an extremely complicated bill, as I am sure the debate will reveal as we move forward. The funding mechanisms of assisted housing are extremely complicated, and to bring such a bill on the floor, particularly at a time of fiscal stringency when we are in essence shooting at a moving target in terms of the budget resolution, takes no small degree of skill. The House obviously owes a great debt of gratitude to the subcommittee chair-

man for being able to bring us this bill so promptly.

I do not want to recover the details of the bill, which have been so ably covered by the chairman but, rather, to focus on a few points which I gather from the discussions which have been had informally and on the floor of the House during debate on the rule are of concern to Members of this body.

First, we are below our section 302(b) allocation, tentative as it is, but not by much. We have a little over \$4 million in leeway. I know there are many members who were disappointed that various projects in which they were interested, therefore, could not move forward. I happen to have a Veterans' Administration hospital in my district which is scheduled for a substantial expansion of its outpatient facilities because of terrible overcrowding. We were not able to reach that this year, and I know there are other Members who are concerned because

their projects have not been reached. I can only say that, within the limits we have, we have done what we could, and I urge Members not to offer amendments that would take us over our section 302(b) allocation.

In addition, as the subcommittee chairman has pointed out, we are over \$1 billion below our fiscal year 1985 enacted level. I think that represents a very significant savings in this bill. We are, it is true, well above the administration's request, but that is because the administration requested no funds for assisted housing, having proposed a 2-year freeze on those programs. Plainly, in the action on the first budget resolution that has so far taken place, both this body and the other body rejected that approach and did supply budget authority for the assisted housing programs. We have responded to that action on the part of both bodies and, therefore, have included funding for the assisted housing programs in this bill, which is

what puts us over the administration's request.

I know there are some Members of this House who are concerned because there is not a freeze on each and every item within this bill. Let me say straight out that I do not envisage that to be the charge that we in the Appropriations Committee have received from the House. Under the Budget Act we are required to come within our section 302(b) allocation, and as I indicated, we have done that.

There has been a strong sentiment for freeze in this House, and we have done that in terms of the bill as a whole. As I indicated, the bill is below our fiscal year 1985 enacted level. But we believe that it is appropriate that the Appropriations Committee and the full House have the flexibility to make adjustments within the overall bill in order to meet situations of need where those occur and to achieve savings where those can be achieved. Thus, if you want to compare this bill with the administration's request, on some items we are higher, on many we are the same, and in many we are lower. Similarly, if you want to compare this bill with last year's bill, we have not just frozen everything. On some items we are higher, on some items we are the same, and on many items we are lower.

I simply ask the Members to recognize this process and not just let the word, "freeze," apply to each line item in the bill. That would be a foolish consistency indeed, and it would make no sense from the point of view of the appropriation process in the House to function in that fashion.

We have allowed for increases in some activities. We have taken the pains of finding where to cut other activities or otherwise we could not come out below where we were last year. Having done that, I do ask the House to stand with us, recognize the work that has been done, and approve this bill. It represents a very significant effort to deal with the programs, the very important programs with which this subcommittee is charged, programs such as housing, veterans, the environment, our space programs, our science programs, and many others, while at the same time staying within the guidelines established by the House in the first budget resolution and, I think, reflecting the will of the House to hold these bills at or below last year's level.

This we have accomplished 100 percent, Mr. Chairman, and I ask the House to stay with us and approve this bill.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SCHUMER].

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. Chairman, I thank my distinguished colleague, the

gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BOLAND], and I rise in support of this legislation.

Let me say that I think Appropriations Committee, the subcommittee and the committee as a whole, has done an outstanding job, and I speak from two perspectives. As a member of the Housing Subcommittee of the Banking Committee of the House, let me say that we have in the last 4 years suffered tremendous cuts. A total authorization in housing of \$31 billion, roughly \$31 billion in 1981, has shrunk to an authorization of just about half that amount. Yet there is a crying need for housing in this country. We hear about homeless people, we hear about poor people who cannot find housing, and now we have begun to hear about middle-class people, the kind of people who have had the American dream on their calendar and who had thought that once they were married and got jobs they would be able to find housing for themselves, but now they cannot. So we have a dramatic need for housing, and the Housing Subcommittee has tried to take into account those needs.

I also speak as a member of the Budget Committee, and as a freshman member of the Budget Committee, let me assure the Members of the House that that changes one's perspective a great deal.

□ 1450

To try and deal with the deficit that is only going to get worse and worse unless we do something is a painful and painstaking process. It is difficult to find \$50 and \$100 million there to bring the deficit reduction under control.

I have lived with that process, as have so many members of the Budget Committee, for the last 6 months. If you put those two things together and realize, No. 1, the desperate needs that we have in this country, needs that now extend to many, many districts in this country, certainly a majority, needs that extend to many different types and classes of people, and yet at the same time realize the looming deficit cloud that constantly hovers over our head, I think you can only come out where this resolution does. It is within the House budget resolution. It tries particularly in the reserve portion of the program to come up with some innovative and cost-efficient programs and preserve others, dramatic changes from the days of section VIII, which the majority of people in this House thought was too expensive and affected too few people.

Yet also while dealing with those needs, it does try to live, and does indeed live, within the budget resolution.

To ask for new programs probably scuttles the work that this subcommittee has done and pushes us over the

budget resolution. We cannot ask for any more than we have; but to cut any further simply because there may not be in one's own district the people knocking at the door for the needs of housing would also be a lesson to those on the Housing Subcommittee and the authorizing committee and to so many in this House that to painstakingly live within the budget resolution is not worth it all, because you go to the House floor and because housing and so many other areas here are not the No. 1 items on most people's political agendas, you say, well, cut those.

The lesson then would be, cut those further.

The lesson then would be, "Don't live within the budget resolution, start off as high as you can, because you're going to be cut on the floor anyway."

So I would say to my colleagues in conclusion that this is a fine, well honed appropriation. It does not make everybody perfectly happy, but it does live within the two goals, the two parameters within which we must live, the parameter of a need for housing and the parameter of an increasing deficit.

Mr. Chairman, I urge support of this resolution.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. COUGHLIN].

Mr. COUGHLIN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to take this opportunity to comment briefly on our recommendations for the fiscal year 1986 budget for the Environmental Protection Agency.

Prior to commenting upon specific EPA items, I want to commend the subcommittee's distinguished chairman, Mr. BOLAND, for his tireless work on H.R. 3038. The guidance and invaluable efforts of Mr. GREEN, the ranking minority member or our subcommittee, also have enabled us to present this carefully crafted proposal to the full House for consideration. I want to thank both Mr. BOLAND and Mr. GREEN for all their help in making significant strides in the budget of the Environmental Protection Agency.

I believe our recommendations will provide EPA with the resources necessary to continue to successfully achieve its statutory objectives and to protect human health and the environment.

The relatively modest increases proposed for EPA over last year's funding level will provide important practical benefits. For example, our bill provides \$50 million for the school asbestos abatement program. The magnitude of the costs facing local schools in their attempt to curb these potential hazardous conditions justifies a Federal role in assisting school districts in financial need. To insure that any asbestos abatement work under-

taken with these Federal funds are environmentally sound and safe, our panel has included requirements. Specifically, under our bill any abatement projects funded by the program must be conducted by contractors that have been certified by the States and by workers who have received training through programs approved by EPA.

H.R. 3038 also provides: additional enforcement funds and staff positions for the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act's program which regulates the handling and disposal of hazardous wastes; a full-scale demonstration of limestone injection multistage burning technology [LIMB], a potential acid rain reduction technology that promotes cleaner burning of coal; \$3 million for exposure assessment studies of toxic pollutants; \$5 million for State grants to expand innovative State and local activities in inventorying and reducing hazardous waste generation and a \$2 million program for estuarine management. These are just a few important initiatives our subcommittee has taken to assist EPA to fulfill its myriad responsibilities.

I also want to mention, as my colleagues are aware, that our panel deferred spending decisions on the Superfund Program and the Clean Water Act's Wastewater Treatment Construction Grants Program pending enactment of authorization bills for the two programs. As you know, the authorizations for these programs expire at the end of September.

I pledge, however, my strongest support for efforts to appropriate funds for these vital programs as expeditiously as possible once the required authorizations bills advance through Congress.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, I want to urge my colleagues to support these modest EPA increases we propose. The panel has provided EPA with the resources necessary to continue its attempts to meet its environmental mandate. The benefits our citizenry will reap from these moderate hikes in EPA's budget demand our support.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to a member of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BONER].

Mr. BONER of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Department of Housing and Urban Development—Independent Agencies Appropriations bill. I particularly would like to compliment the chairman of my committee, Mr. BOLAND, for leading the members of the committee through many difficult program choices.

Let me underscore some of the remarks that have already been made during this debate. The bill is below the total amount of money appropriated for the same departments, agencies, and programs in fiscal year 1985. In its entirety, the bill is more than \$1

billion below the amount appropriated last year for these same programs. Additionally, the bill is below the House budget resolution allocations.

Within the level of funding provided, the members of the Appropriations Committee have tried to make difficult choices between and among programs. As a result, the committee is recommending funding for some programs that are higher than fiscal year 1985, but it has offset those increases with corresponding reductions in other programs. These recommendations, these choices, these decisions setting priorities were made only after the committee reviewed all of the programs in its jurisdiction. These were not easy choices but we hope that our colleagues here in the House will endorse the recommendations contained in the bill.

I would like to offer some comments on the funding level recommended for NASA. I joined a majority of my colleagues in voting to freeze funding for NASA at the fiscal year 1985 level. I certainly do not regret that vote. In fact, I believe that the House vote to freeze NASA's authorization increased the scrutiny the committee focused on NASA's budget request. In doing so, the committee tried to assure a stream of funding for those NASA programs nearing a level of maturity while deferring, where possible, those new and young programs that could afford to be deferred. In addition, the committee worked to assure adequate funding for some programs whose delay would result in significant cost increases over the life of the program. This is the case with the NASA recommendations for the Space Station Program.

While I would have liked to fund fully the request for the space station, I believe the level provided for the program by the committee is the minimum necessary to assure that the space station options are fully studied. As my colleagues know, the inclusion of man in the operation of the space station and the full development of robotics and automated systems is currently being studied. NASA has initiated these studies and their successful completion is the first necessary step to constructing the space station.

Several other NASA programs deserve the level of funding the committee has recommended. One of these is the advanced communications satellite [ACTS], a program which will continue the United States' lead in meeting future communication needs.

For the Department of Housing and Urban Development, the committee has recommended what I believe is the minimum necessary to meet our Nation's housing needs. Again, I join many of my colleagues in wishing the House could provide a higher level of funding. But, in light of the budget constraints imposed by the House, the level of support provided in the bill as-

sure continued public housing, vouchers, section 8 and section 202 units, and adequate funding to support rental rehabilitation and low-income housing operational assistance.

Lastly, Mr. Chairman, I ask my colleagues to support the committee's recommendation for the Veterans Administration. We are all well aware of the increasing numbers of aging veterans who may need medical assistance. The bill continues this Nation's commitment to provide assistance to our veterans, not only in terms of new hospital and outpatient facilities construction but also the medical personnel necessary to staff these facilities.

I encourage my colleagues to join in support of the committee's recommendations. The bill reflects the committee's considered judgment on what programs need and deserve funding while complying with the votes earlier this year to reduce Federal expenditures.

□ 1500

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BARTLETT].

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

During the debate, I will concentrate on that portion of the bill that is in the housing assistance program. I have a chart to share with the Members of the Committee to consider that portion of the bill that is between the fiscal year 1985 and fiscal year 1986 appropriations.

Several have said earlier that this is a complex bill, and indeed, it is. I will attempt to make it direct and straightforward.

Someone else said that we do not have to have a freeze on each and every line item, and I agree with that. And what I have attempted to do is to secure at least freeze level for that \$10 billion of the total or aggregate section of the assisted public housing or the assisted housing programs.

Now I think the House understands what a freeze level means. It means a freeze level to where we spend no more in the total in 1986 than we spent in 1985.

What we have in the assisted housing portion of this HUD appropriation bill is a nominal freeze on the surface, but it is impossible that it could be a freeze in reality because, in fact, when you look at each program, line by line, you discover that virtually all of the programs have been increased, some by as much as 100 percent, and no programs have been reduced by any significant amount.

Let me share with my colleagues precisely where the difference between the nominal freeze and the bona fide freeze would be. First, in the area of modernization of public housing, now that is the area that repairs

existing units of public housing. It is a good program and it ought to be. Last year, in fiscal year 1985, we spent \$1.7 billion in that, but we did so, as the House has historically done, by appropriating both the principal and the interest in the HUD appropriation bill. In the fiscal year 1986, we appropriated \$700 million, a nominal \$1 billion decrease, but the difficulty is we change the accounting formula so that we only appropriate the principal and the interest is shuffled over to the function 900 of the total Federal budget, so we are spending the \$900 million in another place off the HUD appropriation, and yet we are counting that \$900 million saving for additional programs.

The same holds true in the non-recurring items of the rent supplement and rental assistance program. That is a program which has essentially ended. It is not a program to help people or to transfer payments. That is a program in which last year we appropriated \$1.6 billion for a one-time-only conversion, and it was a conversion of 236 units to section 8 units. We had to buy out the contracts. All of those contracts are now purchased.

Then we spent, in essence, of that \$1.6 billion, we spent \$800 million. That is a conversion that is already completed. It is not a recurring program. But the appropriations bill was to take that \$800 million and spend it again in new programs.

What I will be proposing a little later will be essentially to back both of those accounting changes out of the bill with three amendments to bring the total appropriations down to a true freeze of \$8.9 billion. If you take the \$10.7 billion in new authority in fiscal year 1985, reduce it by the \$900 million of modernization, of interest payments, reduce it by the \$800 million of rental supplements, which is a conversion program, which has already been spent, there are no more contracts to buy, then you come up with a true freeze of \$8.9 billion.

I will be proposing in essence three amendments to come down to that amount. I will be freezing the amount of newly constructed public housing units to last year's level.

Now it is true that the administration proposed a 1-year moratorium.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BARTLETT] has expired.

● Mrs. ROUKEMA. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the amendment to be offered by my colleague from the Housing Subcommittee, Mr. BARTLETT.

This amendment would strike from the bill \$500 million which the Appropriations Committee has recommended be earmarked for new and unauthorized programs. To me, this is the height of fiscal irresponsibility.

This year both the House and the other body agreed in separate budget resolutions that we need to reduce the budget deficit by over \$50 billion this year and by nearly \$300 billion over the next 3 years. Does it make sense under these circumstances to approve funding for unauthorized programs? We are talking about \$500 million for programs which the full House has not even had the opportunity to review.

Faced with \$200 billion deficits for as far as the eye can see, it is totally inappropriate for Congress to be authorizing any new housing programs. We have had a hard enough time finding money for programs that are currently operative and in dire need of sustained funding. To allocate money for new, unauthorized programs would be irresponsible and would fly in the face of reason.

As a member of the Housing Subcommittee that has only recently completed markup of H.R. 1, the housing authorization bill, I have had an opportunity to observe and engage in the heated controversy that has surrounded committee deliberations on these new programs. My colleagues, this is neither the time nor the place to continue the debate regarding these new housing programs—we will have that opportunity when the housing authorization bill reaches the floor—but let me just briefly say that many of these proposed new programs are costly, and redundant.

By way of clarification, in addition to funding for the Department of Housing and Urban Development, many independent agencies also receive appropriations through H.R. 3038. For example, \$26.5 billion is provided for the Veterans' Administration and some very meritorious veterans programs.

Of this amount, \$14.2 billion is for veterans compensation and pensions and \$9.4 billion is earmarked for medical care and treatment. Mr. Chairman, I want to make it perfectly clear that I believe we, as a nation, owe our veterans a great debt. I have consistently supported veterans programs. The increased funding for veterans programs in his bill recognizes the fact that in coming years, millions of World War II and Korean conflict veterans will become eligible for and need veterans health care. Therefore, my speaking against one aspect of this, this comprehensive appropriations bill should in no way be construed as a stand against funding for important and necessary veterans programs.

My colleagues, in closing, let me stress, this House has not authorized new housing programs, we have not agreed on the need for new programs, and we certainly cannot justify the new costs of these programs. To set aside money for programs that are yet unauthorized would be irresponsible;

and there are far better places in the budget where the money could be put to use. I urge you to support the Bartlett amendment. ●

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MORRISON].

Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman of the subcommittee for yielding me this time, and I want to start by commending him and his entire committee on bringing in a housing program, and in fact an entire appropriation which does the two necessary things that we have to do in this budget and appropriation process this year.

No. 1, it conforms itself to the budget requirements. It is within the budget, and it is comfortably within the budget. And beyond that, it makes the difficult choices to fund the programs that are needed in this country that ought to be supported by Federal funds.

First let us look at the budget matter. We have had debate after debate about freezing and limiting spending, and I have been proud to have been a part of that debate and to try to take a leadership role. And one of the questions that is always raised is are we denying the proper flexibility to reallocate funds from one area to another but to stay within a reasonable budget amount? The answer to that has always been that the way to do that job is through the budget process. And in this appropriation and in the response of this committee to this appropriation we have just that effect.

Today we have received, we understand, on the House floor now as a result of the resolution passed this morning, the section 302(b) allocation. We know what is available within the budget that we have passed for this committee and under its jurisdiction.

What we have before us is \$3.4 billion below that level, so it certainly is within the budget, and on top of that the \$4.1 billion beneath the spending level for 1985.

The committee has reserved the funds which may be necessary for future authorizations in the area of the EPA and the area of housing programs; \$3.3 billion is reserved in its entirety, and within the housing budget a half billion dollars is reserved, and not allocated based on future authorizations that may come from the committee of authorization jurisdiction.

These budget savings did not come without a price. There are cuts that are difficult to be absorbed. We have \$110 million lower spending in the area of urban development action grants, and \$350 million less available in community development block grants, and a 25-percent cut, over \$1.1 million in the area of revenue sharing.

These are real cuts and they are real reductions in Federal spending. They hurt in the communities, but they are the price we are paying for budget discipline.

As a member of the Housing Subcommittee, I am particularly pleased to see the maintenance of necessary housing starts for the next year. We have heard criticism by the prior speaker about the budget level. Somehow it is wrong, it is argued, that this year as well we are going to provide 100,000 new units of housing for low-income and elderly Americans who need it.

I do not think that anyone could question the need. Certainly I know that the hearings before our Subcommittee on Housing have suggested that this only scratches the surface. And I think most Members of this body know that is true.

We have been able at least to freeze and maintain the level of effort with respect to new housing, and I think that that is an accomplishment and it ought not to be criticized. It ought to be supported, and it certainly ought not to be cut back by arguing that savings that have been made in other areas, which may be less important, cannot be used in this area to maintain our effort. In fact, that is exactly what the budget process is about.

For that reason, I urge the Members to support this appropriation as reported. I want to note in particular that with respect to the elusive 5-percent pay cut that in some areas has created problems, this subcommittee has taken a responsible road and provided the funds in its appropriation to cover that 5-percent pay restoration which we all knew was never going to happen in the first place.

The overall picture here is one of responsible allocation of limited resources to do a job that is much in need of doing. I commend the committee in its entirety for having brought us this appropriation, and I urge the Members of this House not to make budget constraint into a fetish by which each and every line item is cut without looking at the picture as a whole. We have now done the job of putting our budget into our House rules and making it effective. We have got an overall target. We are meeting that target.

Let us approve the bill.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes and 30 seconds to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ROTH].

Mr. ROTH. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

I have a message for the President. Popular folklore has it that the President sometimes watches floor debate. Well, Mr. President, I want to inform you that this particular bill we are debating today is \$10 billion above your budget request.

□ 1510

Mr. President, you have often said that if Congress does not do the proper cutting, you are going to send your surgeon to Capitol Hill to do some real cutting.

Well, Mr. President, my advice would be to send your surgeon and to send him quickly. Some people may tell you that we are not giving away the entire grocery store, and that may be true. But we are certainly giving away most of the groceries in the store.

This measure represents an improvement over the housing authorizing measure, H.R. 1, in addressing the needs of the low-income housing needs of this country but it hardly resembles a budget-cutter's dream.

I regret, for example, that the bill calls for doubling the number of units of new construction. However, overall it does recognize that we need to make a switch from emphasis on new construction programs to those which utilize existing housing stock but it appropriates entirely too much money in the process. We cannot any longer afford the convenience of sticking with the same, tired old concepts, or the impulsiveness of buying off on fashionable new products. What we can do is improve programs that have worked in the past and streamline and eliminate other programs. This bill goes only so far, but not far enough, in that direction.

I applaud the Appropriations Committee's recognition that housing vouchers are an important component of this Nation's housing law and should be retained. The bill before us today provides for 30,000 freestanding vouchers.

The Housing Subcommittee has been slow to recognize, even after 10 years of experience, that this program may be the best way to house needy families. The Appropriations Committee has again had the wisdom to fund this housing program.

During the Banking Committee markup I successfully offered an amendment to untie the voucher program from rental rehabilitation. This will help ensure that the vouchers we are funding in this bill will represent a fair test of the program.

Vouchers provide housing assistance to eligible families at a lower cost than any other housing program. They allow an assisted family to obtain decent, safe and sanitary rental housing and guarantee payment to the landlord for a portion of the rent. With the continued recognition of this valuable program, HUD has been able to assist more families than ever while at the same time decreasing the assisted housing debt.

Congress has an obligation to reduce the Federal deficit while continuing to help the most needy. We must act responsibly in affirming our Nation's

commitment to provide decent, safe, and affordable housing for those who are needy. This must be accomplished, however, within the context of fiscal responsibility. I am confident that these two goals can be met.

Amendments which will be offered to the bill by members of the Housing subcommittee will enable us to meet both goals. I urge my colleagues to achieve an honest "budget freeze" for housing. The measure before us is by no means a freeze. An amendment to be offered by Mr. BARTLETT will help us achieve a freeze in assisted housing.

The bill allows for \$500 million for new program reserves. This is not the time to be obligating funds to programs not yet authorized.

Also, this bill does authorize 10,000 new public housing units. Again, here we need to recognize that the housing needs of the low income can be best served by utilizing existing housing units, not by constructing new housing projects. We should restore the 1985 level for newly constructed housing units to 5,000.

It has often been said: "Little holes will sink a big ship." Well, this is not just a little hole, it's \$10 billion.

So I would advise that we take a realistic look at this legislation because it is very important if we are going to keep the deficit under control.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California [Mr. COELHO].

Mr. COELHO. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to enter into a colloquy with the chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee on HUD and Independent Agencies, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BOLAND].

I would like to ask the chairman about the administration's \$6 million request for land for a national cemetery in northern California. As the chairman knows, the House has approved legislation directing the VA to establish the cemetery on land in Merced County, CA, a private owner is willing to donate. Am I correct then in assuming that the committee deleted those funds because it now appears that the VA will not have to pay for the land—because the cemetery will be built on donated land?

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COELHO. I yield to the chairman of the subcommittee.

Mr. BOLAND. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from California is correct.

Mr. COELHO. One more point, Mr. Chairman. It is my understanding that the VA has the funds to begin design and planning and can proceed with this phase as soon as it acquires the

land. Therefore, I would ask to have some assurance that the deletion of these funds is no indication of a lack of support for this project. I would hope that at such time as construction funds are needed, and a request is submitted in a supplemental this year or in the fiscal year 1987 budget, it will be given due and favorable consideration by the committee.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. COELHO. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. BOLAND. I thank the gentleman for yielding further.

Mr. Chairman, deletion of the \$6 million in no way conveys a lack of support by the committee and I can assure the gentleman that any request for construction funds submitted by the administration will receive the most careful review and sympathetic consideration.

Mr. COELHO. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the assurance of the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3½ minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FIELDS].

Mr. FIELDS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 3038, the HUD-independent agencies appropriation bill for fiscal year 1986. Funding for a project of deep personal concern to me and to the 450,000 veterans in the Houston VA Medical Center's primary service area is funded. H.R. 3038 appropriations \$226 million for the replacement of the Houston VA Medical Center.

Shortly after coming to Congress in 1981, the veterans of my district suggested that I visit the Veterans' Administration Hospital in Houston. I agreed. While I expected that the facility might not be optimum, I have to tell you that I was not prepared for what I saw.

I was immediately struck by a glaring lack of patient privacy. Bed after bed was divided only by privacy curtains. In fact, the joint Commission on Accreditation of Hospitals has cited the Houston Medical Center for lack of adequate patient privacy. Toilet and bathing facilities were limited and were in deplorable condition. Handicapped access was almost nonexistent in a facility which by its very nature serves a large number of handicapped individuals.

I saw many departments of the hospital, such as ambulatory care, fragmented into different locations. The outlay of the medical center was an architect's nightmare, with various structures added on through the years to try to keep pace with growing demand and new technology. Because of these piecemeal additions along with an outmoded general design, interrelated areas such as surgery and intensive care were located wherever

physically possible, not where functionally efficient. Many of the hospital's buildings were constructed in the mid-1940's with a life expectancy of 15 years, yet are still in use.

Finally, I was appalled by safety deficiencies such as inadequate smoke detectors, sprinklers, smoke partitions, and fire alarm systems. I could go on and on, but time does not permit.

Since that initial shocking visit to the Houston VA Medical Center, I have returned numerous times. Each visit rededicates me to the effort to ensure congressional approval of adequate funds to replace the Houston facility.

The Houston VA Medical Center first appeared on the Veterans' Administration 5-year facility construction plan of the 10 hospitals most in need of replacement or modernization in 1979. However, for 3 subsequent years nothing happened. The Houston facility was pushed aside in favor of other hospitals below Houston on the priority list.

That's why I became involved. I felt that the full story of our facility's dire need of replacement was not being told, or not being told loudly enough. In 1982, I arranged a meeting with the then-administrator of the Veterans' Administration. Several of my colleagues from the Houston area joined the meeting. Later that year, I was informed that, finally, the Veterans' administration had placed Houston on the advance planning fund for fiscal year 1984 to receive \$5 million for preliminary design planning.

Last year, Congress recognized Houston's need and appropriated \$25.2 million for working drawings and site preparation.

H.R. 3038 would follow through with the commitment Congress made to our veterans last year by appropriating \$226 million, the entire amount needed for the Houston VA replacement project.

I urge favorable consideration of the bill.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HILER].

Mr. HILER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to voice a concern about the way some of the numbers are obtained in the HUD portion of this particular bill, in particular as it relates to the assisted housing provisions.

When we were marking up the housing authorization bill in both the Housing Subcommittee and in the full Committee on Banking, somewhat of an extended discussion took place over the accounting changes as they concern modernization of public housing units.

I do not think anyone in the Housing Subcommittee or in the Banking full committee or on the Appropriations Committee today would say that we are going to do less in modernization for public housing authorities; and yet we are showing in our numbers nearly \$1 billion savings because we are saying that rather than that money being issued to the public housing authority with a, I believe it is a 20-year note and, therefore, putting the total cost of the money going to that public housing authority is not only the actual money itself, but also the interest cost over 20 years; now we are going to treat it as a grant.

Now, the fact is that the Federal Government still has to borrow that money to give that money to the public housing authority, and we have switched the functions. Instead of that interest being charged up to the HUD budget, it is not going to be charged up to the Function 900 budget, and we then use that as a \$1 billion savings to spend in a different area in the HUD budget to basically come up with our saying that this is a frozen level for HUD.

Mr. BARTLETT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HILER. I will be happy to yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, I think the gentleman is saying that the Housing subcommittee does not have an objection to the new accounting method. Our objection is to changing accounting methods, to shifting \$1 billion of spending to another portion of the budget and then counting that as part of the new spending level in HUD appropriations; in essence, spending it twice. That is the gentleman's objection.

Mr. HILER. Reclaiming my time, I would say that is so, although I would caution the gentleman, I am not speaking for the Housing subcommittee; I am speaking for myself, and I think for the gentleman from Texas and some others.

I had offered an amendment in the Housing subcommittee that was ruled out of order, which would have said that the alleged savings that we were going to get should not be then used to justify funding new programs, and yet still come up with the bottom line of spending at a freeze level or below.

So I think that the Members of the House should know that when we vote on the HUD bill, that if this is not changed, if we do not reduce the nearly \$1 billion that has been added to the HUD bill to use this billion dollars in savings; that you will be voting for funny money savings. I think you should be aware of that, and there will be more discussion on that when we get to the amendment process.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. LUNDINE].

Mr. LUNDINE. Mr. Chairman, I have read the fine committee report that accompanies this bill. I was particularly pleased to find language urging the National Science Foundation to support the International Institute for Applied Systems Analysis, known as IIASA.

IIASA was first conceived by President Johnson as a place where East and West could meet and demonstrate that we could work together on common problems that require common solutions. The Institute was later established under President Nixon, with the support of scientific bodies from a dozen countries.

As a member of the Science and Technology Committee, I have met many American scientists who have worked at IIASA. I have learned that the Institute makes valuable contributions in tackling global problems like overpopulation, world climate, and depletion of energy, food, and water resources. These are problems where East-West cooperation is important and noncontroversial.

I was fortunate to be in Vienna for a meeting of the Inter-American Development Bank last March. While there, I led a delegation to IIASA's headquarters and met Prof. Tom Lee of MIT, the new director of the Institute. I was extremely impressed by Dr. Lee and I know that IIASA will continue to make important contributions in the future under his leadership.

Once again, I commend the Appropriation Committee for recognizing the importance of IIASA. I strongly support NSF funding for this valuable institution.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I take this time to respond to a couple of issues that have arisen during the general debate. First, let me deal with the question of the so-called accounting change.

This is a change in the way that the modernization program is funded. I emphasize for my colleagues that this is a change requested by the administration so that in adding this to the bill and in changing the traditional method of funding the modernization program, we have simply acceded to what the administration requested.

I would suggest, however, that the consequences are a little different from what those who have attacked the accounting change, who have questioned its saving, would have you think.

The fact of the matter is, one does save dollars when one buys for cash instead of buying on the installment plan. They get around that by seeking to charge this account, alone of all the accounts in the budget, with the interest on the national debt.

Now, if you wanted to charge accounts that way, we would have not a \$300 billion defense bill but a \$1,300 billion defense bill by the time we pay off all the borrowing for the Defense authorization bill that this House passed earlier this year.

The fact of the matter is that as the modernization program has worked in the past, the Federal Government entered into contracts with local housing authorities to pay for 20-year borrowing by the local housing authority; and the Federal contract agreed to pay both the principal amount of the debt incurred by the housing authority to conduct the modernization work and the interest on that principal amount. Depending on what interest rates were at the time, that meant that the total amount it would cost the Federal Government as it paid off on that contract, over a 20-year period, would be approximately twice the cost of the work; it has been a little more than twice what the work would cost if we paid up front.

Of course, as the gentleman points out, if we pay it up front we have to borrow money because we are having a deficit this year and there will be interest on that money; but when we pay it over time and we have deficits, we have to borrow more than twice as much money; and we therefore have to pay more than twice as much interest on the national debt, because we have bought on the installment plan.

Essentially what the administration is seeking to do is to stop buying housing modernization on the installment plan, to pay for it up front, and to save money the way any household would that pays for its goods up front instead of buying on time.

Mr. BARTLETT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREEN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BARTLETT. Rather than debate all of the merits and demerits, the point is, is without debating the merits of the new accounting system; of whether it is paid up front or on the installment plan, all we are asking is that it be an apples-to-apples comparison, so that however we accounted for it, in fiscal year 1985, we account for it in the same manner in fiscal year 1986.

The Congressional Budget Office, for example, has sent a letter in which they conclude there are no net savings in outlays to the Federal budget as a whole, since the proposed financing methods would simply cancel a host of intergovernmental transfers.

The point is that all we ask is that we compare, is that we calculate fiscal year 1985 the same way we calculated fiscal year 1986 so then we can come to a freeze baseline; not that we calculate them—the appropriations bill has fiscal year 1986 calculated a new way,

and it takes the \$900 million that is taken out and counts it as a savings.

Mr. GREEN. If I may reclaim my time, the problem is we are not comparing apples; we are comparing dollars. And when you compare dollars, there is a real dollar savings from paying cash instead of borrowing; any family that has to make a purchase either for cash or on the installment plan knows which way it comes out. That is why we have truth in lending legislation.

Let me now move on, however, to the question of the reserve fund. I would like to say to the House that this reserve fund is an effort on the part of the Appropriations Committee to accommodate the authorizing committee; in this case, the Banking Committee.

□ 1530

It would have been easy enough for us to sit down and write out \$500 million of items on which we chose to spend the money. We have deferred to the Banking Committee by holding this fund in reserve so that its members may fulfill their function under the House rules and make a determination as to what housing programs this House ought to have. But we have been honest with the House. We have told the House that we anticipate that we will be applying this money to assisted housing before the budget process is over. I think that is the honest way to do it. I do not think we should be criticized for it. I think we should be applauded for the deference we have shown the Banking Committee and for the honesty we have shown the House by accounting for this situation in this manner.

Mr. BARTLETT. If the gentleman will yield, I have a great deal of respect for the gentleman from New York, I work a great deal with him on housing matters and I appreciate the Appropriations Committee attempting to accommodate the Banking Committee. What the Members of the House would like would be for the Appropriations Committee to accommodate the 435 Members of the House who have not yet had an opportunity to review the creation of these five new programs.

So we as Members of the House as a whole would seek to withhold judgment and to have a real debate on those new programs before the money is appropriated.

Mr. GREEN. If I can reclaim my time, since I have only about a minute left, before that money gets applied to specific programs the house will have two shots at it, once in the authorizing legislation, when that is scheduled, and once in any supplemental appropriation or continuing resolution when we identify the reserve with specific

programs. We are not denying the House that opportunity. We are simply alerting the House that it is the intention of the committee to come back to the House with specific recommendations after we have heard what the Banking Committee chooses to do and the House has approved it.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. ANDREWS].

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, it gives me great pleasure to note that today the veterans' hospital replacement project was fully funded by the House. This hospital project will be a critical link in our ability to provide ongoing medical care to the veterans in Houston and throughout my region of the country.

According to the Veterans' Administration, by the year 2000 the number of veterans over 65 will more than double to 9 million, making 2 out of 3 elderly males in the United States eligible for Veterans' Administration medical care. This hospital is a vital part of the response to a dramatically growing need. Our veterans who have risked their lives for our way of life deserve the best medical care available. This hospital will provide such care. We have faced difficulties and setbacks in planning for this replacement hospital facility. It is to the credit of all of the people with whom I've worked for so many months that attention to the needs of American veterans have kept those difficulties to a minimum and helped in their solution. This hospital means so much for American veterans, and I am proud to have worked for its funding.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Louisiana [Mrs. Boggs], a member of the committee.

Mrs. BOGGS. Mr. Chairman, it is with a great deal of pride that I rise in full support of this legislation and to compliment the chairman and the ranking minority member, and all the members of the committee and the staff, for coming forth with a bill of such a comprehensive nature that deals not only with one of the largest departments in the Government, but with 17 of the independent agencies. The particular care which is taken with each of these agencies and with each segment of the Housing and Urban Development Department is absolutely amazing. Sometimes some of the best programs that this bill funds are lost to the public view in the whole comprehensive attitude of the bill.

It is imperative that we consider the many good and measurable benefits of NASA's programs when we consider its budget. Most of the programs carried out by NASA have benefits for our country but are difficult to measure when they are initiated. You have heard about some of these programs by some of my distinguished col-

leagues. I would like to review one of NASA's programs that I have supported and have a special interest in that it has produced remarkable and very measurable benefits. This is NASA's Search and Rescue Program—sometimes called the COSPAS/SARSAT Program. This program saves lives.

In 1978, NASA requested a new start to support their idea of developing a system using polar orbiting satellites to detect crashed airplanes and sinking boats. Congress supported its request.

By 1979, NASA with its unique facilities and people were not only able to complete the design of the system but they put together a team of U.S. agencies including the Coast Guard, Air Force, and NOAA and formed an international team with France and Canada. Later that same year they formed an additional team with the Soviet Union to jointly develop and fund the system.

In 1982, after less than 4 years of work, the first satellite [COSPAS I] was launched. Within weeks of the first launch, while NASA was performing preliminary tests, the satellite detected a red emergency in the wilderness of British Columbia—and three lives were saved.

Today, we have three Soviet and two American satellites in orbit. As of this morning, 475 lives—(over one-half of them American)—have been saved by this program. The COSPAS/SARSAT system has been declared operational and nine nations are now participating in the program. We will probably see over 100 nations involved in the program within 10 years.

So far 475 pilots, fishermen, and explorers have been saved by this NASA program—a very measurable benefit.

When we consider NASA's budget, remember the Search and Rescue Program as representative of the many good things NASA does for our great Nation.

● Mr. CONTE. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to join the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, Mr. BOLAND, and the ranking minority member, Mr. GREEN, in bringing to the House floor today H.R. 3038, the bill making appropriations for the Department of Housing and Urban Development and independent agencies for fiscal year 1986.

I would like to take this opportunity to thank the chairman, the ranking minority member, and each of my colleagues on the subcommittee for their swift and responsible action in reporting out this measure. This is the fifth regular appropriation bill which we bring to the floor this year. With very few legislative days remaining in this fiscal year, it is important that we move as expeditiously as possible to complete work on this and other bills so that they may be sent to the other

body and enacted into law before October 1.

This bill contains \$57.8 billion in new budget authority for the Department of Housing and Urban Development and 17 independent agencies for fiscal year 1986. This is approximately \$1.011 billion below fiscal year 1985 enacted levels, and \$10,352 billion above the budget request.

The majority to the increase over the President's request, \$11.4 billion, occurs in the assisted housing account where our committee has rejected the proposed 2-year moratorium on all subsidized housing programs.

While the chairman and the ranking minority member have described some of the important housing, community development, environmental, veterans, emergency management, scientific, consumer and educational programs and activities funded through this bill, I would like to take a moment to highlight a few of the programs which we have included for fiscal year 1985.

For the Department of Housing and Urban Development, we have recommended \$3.124 billion for community development block grants, the same as the budget request and as assumed in the House-passed budget resolution. We have provided \$330 million to continue the Urban Development Action Grant Program, a 25-percent reduction from the 1985 levels, but a significant restoration of the President's request for program termination.

We have restored the section 8/section 202 level of 12,000 units at the fiscal year 1985 level to maintain our commitment to provide housing for elderly and handicapped Americans, and have recommended \$735.3 million for the modernization of public housing. In addition to the 100,000 incremental assisted housing units, our committee also recommends \$75 million for the Rental Rehabilitation Grants Program and \$75 million for Rental Housing Development Grants Program. We have also recommended \$20 million for the Solar Energy and Conservation Bank, and \$1 million for the Housing Assistance Council, the national non-profit corporation which has been established to increase the availability of decent housing for rural, low-income people.

Out of our \$1.5 billion recommendation for the Environmental Protection Agency, we have provided \$1.5 million to upgrade the national emissions data system to make possible an accurate inventory of industrial emissions related to acid rain, an increase of \$4 million over the request for hazardous waste and ground water research, \$5 million for the Clean Lakes Program, and \$50 million for the School Asbestos Abatement Program.

For the Federal Emergency Management Agency, we are recommending \$631.7 million. Included in this total is

\$70 million for the Emergency Food and Shelter Program and a continuation of funding for the Neighborhood Antiarson and National Community Volunteer Fire Prevention Programs.

Our committee's recommendations for NASA total \$7.66 billion, and include a minimum of \$200 million for phase B definition studies connected with the President's space station initiative. For the National Science Foundation, we recommend \$1.523 billion, including \$60.55 million for science education activities. The fiscal year 1986 recommendation for the Veterans' Administration totals \$26.503 billion.

Mr. Chairman, as you know, the administration has indicated its opposition to the bill as reported by the committee. In one of his last "Dear Sir" letters, our good friend, the young slasher, the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, indicates that the most seriously objectionable increases are the \$330 million UDAG provision, \$70 million for the Emergency Food and Shelter Program, \$99 million for the construction of major Veterans' Administration projects, a \$129 million increase over the request for EPA operating programs and a \$279 million increase over the request for Veterans' Administration medical care.

Mr. Chairman, as you know, the committee has recommended deferral of fiscal year 1986 action on four specific issues until such time as the appropriate authorizing committees act on matters within their jurisdiction. These include: EPA wastewater treatment construction grants, the Superfund, the Fair Housing Initiatives Program and several additional housing programs.

I think that each of us is disappointed with one aspect or another of this bill. Some of us would like to see some increases for a change in assisted housing programs for the elderly, handicapped, and low-income. Some of us would like to see new veterans medical facilities for our needy veteran population or additional funding for science education at the precollege or university level. I, myself, am sorry to see just another \$50 million going into the acid rain research effort at EPA, and I regret that I cannot stand here proudly before you to explain a strong, responsible control program initiative. It is not here.

But in light of the need for fiscal restraint, the absence of necessary authorizing legislation, and the clear and continued responsibility which we have to provide shelter, medical care, environmental protection and scientific and technological advancement for the citizens of this great country, I believe that we have before us a responsible bill which deserves our support.

In over 20 days of hearings, including testimony from more than 300 wit-

nesses filling 9 volumes of hearings and 7,500 pages, our committee has crafted a fair and reasonable bill. In light of the assumptions made in the House-passed budget resolution, and action which we await from a wide number of authorizing committees, I believe that we have acted responsibly. I urge the support of my colleagues for H.R. 3038. ●

● Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Chairman, during debate on the supplemental appropriations bill passed by the House on June 12, 1985, I complimented the leadership of the Appropriations Committee for the restoration of certain funds for the Veterans' Administration, especially for veterans' health care.

Again, I want to thank the very able chairman of the Subcommittee on HUD-Independent Agencies, the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BOLAND] and the distinguished ranking minority member of the subcommittee, Mr. GREEN, for correcting some of the deficiencies in the administration's proposed budget for veterans for the next fiscal year.

For example, the subcommittee took the following actions:

First, it restored the 5-percent pay cut throughout the agency, including the medical care account, to prevent what would be a very serious reduction in VA staffing. The proposed pay cut would have required a reduction of 6,767 FTEE in VA's medical staff—VA is already having to absorb a 1-percent OMB imposed staff reduction of 1,916 FTEE in fiscal year 1986 and will have to reduce current hospital staffing by about 2,000 FTEE in order to fund activations next year.

Second, it continued the staffing level for medical care at the 1985 level of 193,941. This follows earlier committee and House action approving \$152 million to maintain that FTEE level in fiscal year 1985.

Third, it increased medical and prosthetic research by \$8,760,000—some of the most vital and effectively used money available to the VA medical care system to assure quality medical care for veterans.

Fourth, it added the funds necessary to fully fund the replacement hospitals at Philadelphia and Houston. It is very important that we continue to upgrade the medical facilities throughout the country, many of them 50 or more years of age.

Fifth, it prevented the administration from eliminating the VA Nurse Scholarship Program.

Sixth, it provided 13 FTEE for the two pilot programs our committee enacted last year to provide vocational training for certain seriously disabled veterans drawing compensation and pension benefits. We hope to get many of these veterans off the unemployment rolls and back to productive jobs.

These are some of the major differences between the administration's plan for veterans and that proposed by the Appropriations Committee. All of the recommendations of the subcommittee are contained in the committee bill and, again, I want to thank the distinguished and very able chairman of the full committee, Mr. WHITTEN, the distinguished ranking minority member of the full committee, Mr. CONTE, and all members of the Appropriations Committee for their continuing commitment to our veterans and their families. ●

The CHAIRMAN. All time for general debate has expired.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. VENTO] having assumed the chair, Mr. PANETTA, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 3038) making appropriations for the Department of Housing and Urban Development, and for sundry independent agencies, boards, commissions, corporations, and offices for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1986, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

WAIVING CERTAIN POINTS OF ORDER AGAINST CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3037, AGRICULTURE, RURAL DEVELOPMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1986

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 232 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 232

Resolved, That during the consideration of the bill (H.R. 3037) making appropriations for Agriculture, Rural Development, and Related Agencies programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1986, and for other purposes, all points of order against the following provisions in the bill for failure to comply with the provisions of clause 2 of rule XXI are hereby waived: beginning on page 9, line 13 through page 16, line 11; beginning on page 22, lines 1 through 13; beginning on page 25, line 11 through page 26, line 8; beginning on page 27, line 12 through page 28, line 10; beginning on page 29, line 11 through page 30, line 10; beginning on page 30, line 21 through page 31, line 7; beginning on page 32, lines 6 through 13; beginning on page 32, line 20 through page 33, line 4; beginning on page 46, line 9 through page 48, line 8; beginning on page 48, line 23 through page 50, line 21; and beginning on page 52, line 7 through page 53, line 2; and all points of order against the following provisions in the bill for failure to comply with the provisions of clause 6 of rule XXI are hereby waived: beginning on page 22, lines 1 through 13; be-

ginning on page 27, line 12 through page 28, line 10; and beginning on page 46, line 9 through page 48, line 8.

□ 1420

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. TAYLOR], for purposes of debate only, pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 232 waives points of order against several provisions of H.R. 3037, the Department of Agriculture, rural development, and related agencies appropriation bill for fiscal year 1986. The rule does not provide for the bill's consideration because general appropriation bills are privileged under the Rules of the House. Provisions relating to time for general debate are also excluded from the rule. Customarily, general debate is limited by a unanimous-consent request by the chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee prior to consideration of the bill.

Despite the fact that the House and Senate have not yet agreed to a budget resolution for fiscal year 1986, no budget waiver is necessary to allow consideration of this appropriation bill. As Members are aware, on July 24, the House adopted House Resolution 231 which deemed the House-passed budget resolution to have been adopted for purposes of the enforcement provisions of the Budget Act. This allows the House to proceed to consideration of appropriation and other spending legislation without the necessity of a waiver of section 303 of the Budget Act. Under the terms of House Resolution 231, this and other such legislation is subject to all the constraints of the Budget Act.

The rule waives all points of order against specified provisions of the bill for failure to comply with clauses 2 and 6 of rule XXI. Clause 2 of rule XXI prohibits unauthorized appropriations and legislative provisions in general appropriation bills. Clause 6 of rule XXI prohibits reappropriations or transfers in general appropriation bills.

The specific provisions of the bill which have been granted waivers are detailed, by reference to page and line of the bill, in the rule. I also have a copy of a letter from Chairman WHITTEN further describing the provisions protected by the waivers.

The sections granted a waiver of clause 2 of rule XXI in title I of the bill provide appropriations for a number of research and extension programs. These include the Agricultural Research Service, the Cooperative State Research Service, the Extension Service, and the National Agricultural Library. Funding for the Dairy Indemnity Program is also protected from points of order by the rule. In addition, title I contains language dealing with section 32 funds which may con-

stitute legislation in an appropriations bill, and is therefore protected from points of order by the rule.

Clause 2, rule XXI waivers are also necessary to protect rural housing programs in title II of the bill.

In title III of the bill, clause 2, rule XXI waivers are needed for several sections relating to domestic food programs. Title III also contains language dealing with transfer of section 32 funds which may constitute legislation in an appropriation bill, and is, therefore, protected from points of order by the rule.

Title IV of the bill deals with international programs. Clause 2, rule XXI waivers are needed for sections relating to the Public Law 480 Program.

Mr. Speaker, many of the provisions which have been granted clause 2, rule XXI waivers are in various stages of the legislative process. In some cases, the authorizations will be contained in the 1986 farm bill not yet reported by the House Committee on Agriculture. In other cases, legislation has been reported by the authorizing committee but has not yet been considered by the full House. Since the authorizing bills have not been enacted into law, the provisions specified in the rule represent unauthorized appropriations in a general appropriation bill. Therefore, a waiver of clause 2 of rule XXI is necessary.

The rule also protects specified sections of the bill against points of order for failing to comply with clause 6 of rule XXI. In title I, language dealing with the transfer of section 32 funds needs a clause 6, rule XXI waiver, as does the language providing a transfer of funds for the general sales manager of the Commodity Credit Corporation. In title III, the section providing for a transfer of section 32 funds for the child nutrition programs also requires protection from points of order under this clause.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 3037 is an important measure providing appropriations for a variety of programs ranging from measures to assist our Nation's largest industry—agriculture; to domestic nutrition programs, and food-for-peace funds for Africa. The bill has broad bipartisan support.

House Resolution 232 provides for expeditious consideration of this bill, and I urge its adoption.

I yield to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. TAYLOR] for the purposes of debate only.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 232 waives certain points of order against the consideration of the agriculture, rural development and related agencies appropriations bill for 1986.

The purpose of this rule to allow timely consideration of the bill, H.R. 3037, and it therefore waives points of order that would otherwise lie against

specified provisions of the bill for failure to comply with clause 2 and clause 6 of rule XXI.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HALL] has already pointed out that this rule does not contain a waiver of section 303 of the Budget Act, because the House adopted House Resolution 231 earlier today, and thus alleviated the need to waive points of order against consideration of this bill for failure to comply with section 303 of the Budget Act.

Clause 2 of rule XXI prohibits appropriations for any expenditure not previously authorized by law and it also prohibits legislation on an appropriations bill. The waiver recommended by the Committee on Rules is necessary because a number of provisions of H.R. 3037 contain appropriations for which authorizing legislation has not yet been enacted.

Clause 6 of rule XXI prohibits reappropriations or transfers in a general appropriation bill. The waiver recommended by the Committee on Rules is necessary. Several items may be reappropriations.

Mr. Speaker, the various provisions of the bill to which these waivers apply are specified in the resolution, and are provided because of delays in enactment of the 1985 farm bill, the 1985 Housing Act reauthorization, and the foreign assistance authorization bill.

Mr. Speaker, the programs funded by this appropriations bill have generally have been frozen by the Committee on Appropriations at their 1985 funding levels, and the bill covered by this rule maintains current service funding for most of our farm and nutrition programs.

Mr. Speaker, it is certainly not the fault of the Committee on Appropriations that the necessary authorization bills have not been enacted into law, and the action of the Committee on Rules reflects this fact.

Mr. Speaker, there was no controversy about this rule in the Committee on Rules, and the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN], and the ranking Republican member of the Agriculture Subcommittee, the gentlelady from Nebraska [Mrs. SMITH] appeared before the committee united in their request for this rule.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly support this rule because we are rapidly running out of time before the beginning of the new fiscal year.

Mr. BONIOR of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I wish to thank my friend and colleague from Ohio [Mr. HALL], for filling in for me in my absence earlier.

Mr. Speaker, I have no requests for time and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.
The resolution was agreed to.
A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the bill, H.R. 3037, and that I be permitted to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

AGRICULTURE, RURAL DEVELOPMENT AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS BILL, FISCAL YEAR 1986

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill—H.R. 3037—making appropriations for Agriculture, Rural Development, and Related Agencies programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1986, and for other purposes; and pending that motion, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate be limited to not exceed 2 hours, the time to be equally divided and controlled by the gentleman from Nebraska [Mrs. SMITH] and myself.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN].

The motion was agreed to.

□ 1550

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 3037, with Mr. VENTO in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the unanimous consent agreement, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN] will be recognized for 1 hour, and the gentleman from Nebraska [Mrs. SMITH] will be recognized for 1 hour.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN].

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Chairman, we come now to one of the basic actions that the Congress has to take each and every year. It has

been said that with less than 3 percent of our people engaged directly in agriculture today that these few make it possible for us to have food, clothing, and shelter so that the rest of us may have the standard of living that we have today.

Historically, American agriculture has been the custodian of our land for present and future generations. Historically, American agriculture has been our chief earner of dollars in world trade. Historically, it is the biggest market that industry and labor has, and the biggest employer that we have. I hate to say it, but right now we are in a serious situation in agriculture and if we do not look after what is left, the whole country will feel it.

Most folks do not realize that the farm programs of the mid-1930's were to restore the purchasing power of American agriculture.

BUDGET REQUEST

I would call attention here today to the fact that there have been proposals that the Department of Agriculture be abolished, and that the budget submitted to us provides for the abolishment of the conservation programs, the programs that take care of our land for the present and future generations. It calls for the abolishment of rural housing and other rural development programs, and recommends that we abolish most direct farm lending by the Farmers Home Administration at a time when banks and the Farm Credit System are unable to meet the need. It looks like in the coming year the Farmers Home Administration will be nearly the sole source of money with which to farm. The budget works toward abolishing the Rural Electrification Administration. It would abolish all special research grants, those where the Congress has some say about what is done, and where they report to the Congress as to what they are doing. It would abolish all the special programs of the Extension Service, it would convert the Farmers Home Administration to a loan servicing agency and terminate about 4,000 employees. It would convert the Soil Conservation Service to a technical assistance staff and terminate 9,300 employees, and it would reduce access to the feeding programs such as school lunch and elderly feeding.

That is what we had before us. Since there is no way, without abolishing all the programs of the Department, it left us where we had to measure what we recommend by the present year's appropriation under which it is operating.

RECOMMENDED BILL

So I would like to say that our bill is based on the 1985 levels. The bill is under the House-passed budget resolution. It is within the 302 allocation.

We recommend \$36,396 million-plus in obligational authority. We are \$4.2 billion below the 1985 appropriation.

I would like to pause and say that \$9.2 billion will be appropriated to the Commodity Credit Corporation because it is greatly depleted in its ability to meet its obligations.

As I said, it is within the 302 allocation. It is \$916,000 less than the budget. It restores the rural housing program to the 1985 level, restores the conservation programs to the 1985 level, it restores water and sewer loans to \$340 million and grants to \$115 million, restores the Cooperative State Research Service and the Extension Service to about last year's level.

It restores special research grants. It restores nutrition aids and urban gardening, which gives our city colleagues an opportunity to take part in the debate in handling this program.

We restore the REA loan programs and provide that the REA associations shall not be sold except with the support of over half of the Members, and provides that any loans to the Government would have to be repaid, as provided by law.

We fully fund all the food programs, and require a budget request for \$665 million for school lunch, since it is an entitlement program.

LEADED GASOLINE

Mr. Chairman, in our full Committee meeting on this bill, Mr. TRAXLER and Mrs. SMITH of Nebraska offered an amendment to the committee report regarding the Environmental Protection Agency's proposed ban of leaded gasoline. Their amendment to our report passed unanimously. When the report was filed in the House the language of the amendment was inadvertently omitted from the committee's report.

The language that was adopted is as follows:

The committee is concerned that the Environmental Protection Agency's proposed ban of leaded gasoline will impose severe hardship on farmers and ranchers, many of whom utilize machinery powered by leaded-gasoline engines. The Secretary will be expected to fully cooperate with the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency in conducting a study of the use of fuel containing lead additives in gasoline engines which are used in agricultural machinery and are designed to combust fuel containing such additives.

AGRICULTURE ESSENTIAL

Let me repeat again: Here we deal with the relatively few who make our high standard of living, the group to whom we have to look to take care of the soil and the natural resources that we have. It has been the chief dollar earner in world trade, and would be so again if we will sell competitively as we have the authority to do under the

charter of the Commodity Credit Corporation. Not only do we have the right to offer for sale at competitive prices, but we have the obligation, in my opinion, to do so. At a time when the world is begging for food, we are wasting the big advantage we have in providing for the peoples of the world.

We need again to restore the dollar earnings of American agriculture because now we are running a trade deficit of around \$100 billion a year. We are buying that much more than we are selling, and we need to restore the purchasing power of American agriculture.

EMBARGOES

In our bill, we ask for information about what the effects of our policies have been where we have set embargoes against exports. We have put embargoes on the sale of soybeans at one time, a market that we are finding hard to get back. We had an embargo on exporting grain. Now, if you were the middleman, if you bought grain at a time when we had an embargo against selling to Russia and could not sell it, we paid the exporter, but we did not pay the farmer anything. There have been years when we have not used the mechanics of our Government, through the Commodity Credit Corporation, to see that the product is moved. We are asking them to give us the information on that to see what part it has played in the serious situation facing agriculture.

I say further that we have over 59 banks in rural areas that failed this year. American agriculture owes \$214 billion, and I do not know how, at present prices, they are going to pay the interest on that debt.

Mr. Chairman, our bill is within the budget and within the allocation. We are bringing you a bill to restore these services so vital to the American people. Mr. Chairman, this is a good bill and I hope we will have the support of all the Members.

Mrs. SMITH of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 3037, making appropriations for Agriculture, Rural Development, and Related Agencies for fiscal year 1986.

Let me commend my good friend and colleague, the chairman of the full Appropriation Committee and chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Agriculture, Mr. WHITTEN, for his leadership and expertise in drafting a bill that significantly addresses the needs of rural America, but yet serves an extremely broad spectrum of constituencies. I also commend the other members of the subcommittee for their efforts to work in a bipartisan manner on behalf of agriculture. Thanks are extended to the staff for their outstanding assistance.

This bill funds our Child Nutrition and Food Stamp Programs, sends food

for peace donations to hunger-stricken people in Africa and around the world, and provides important assistance to many Americans in our large cities who participate in such activities as the extension service's Urban Gardening and Nutrition Education Programs.

So this bill addresses many high priorities, the highest of which is our agricultural production base. Before pointing out major features of the bill, let me take a moment to review the importance of American agriculture:

Farming, with a work force of 3 million, is the Nation's largest industry, employing as many as the combined work forces of the transportation, steel, and automobile industries.

In all, fully 22 percent of our work force, or 23 million individuals, work in agriculture-related industries throughout our country.

Our export surplus of agricultural products, which is estimated at \$14 billion this fiscal year, is one of the few bright spots in our \$150 billion balance of trade deficit—this in spite of the overvalued dollar.

Let me briefly review key features of the bill, particularly as they relate to Members of this body:

Overall, the amounts in this bill are within the amounts assumed in the House-passed budget resolution.

Funds are included to restore Federal employees pay to the status quo prior to the 5-percent pay cut proposed by the administration's original budget.

Funding for Soil and Water Conservation Programs, which help to preserve two of our most important natural resources, has been restored to levels about the same as fiscal year 1985.

Farmers Home Administration farm ownership, rural housing, and rural development loan levels are nearly identical to last year's level. FmHA farm operating loans total \$3.4 billion—the same as the administration's budget request.

Rural Electrification Administration loan levels are in accordance with the agreement reached earlier this year by the administration, the other body, and the rural electrical cooperatives.

Nearly all special grants funded in fiscal year 1985 by the Agricultural Research Service and the Cooperative State Research Service have been restored in the bill, along with special programs of the Cooperative Extension Service.

The levels of expenditure proposed by this bill represent a bipartisan effort of the Appropriations Committee and our Agriculture Subcommittee to develop a balanced bill that is truly fiscally responsible. Loan levels are either frozen or reduced in nearly every account, and expenditures would be held to levels very close to the original fiscal year 1985 levels.

Therefore, I urge my colleagues to vote for fiscal responsibility and continued support for these programs by approving H.R. 3037.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Agriculture, I wish to express my thanks to the gentlewoman from Nebraska [Mrs. SMITH]. Nobody could be better informed or more interested or work harder. She makes a great contribution, not only in this area but in many other areas.

I do not believe there is a better subcommittee membership anywhere. The subcommittee is composed of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. TRAXLER]; the gentleman from New York [Mr. McHUGH]; the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. NATCHER], with whom I have served for many years on the subcommittee; the gentleman from Hawaii [Mr. AKAKA]; the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. WATKINS]; the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN]; the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SMITH]; the gentlewoman from Nebraska [Mrs. SMITH], whom I mentioned; the gentleman from Indiana, Mr. JOHN MYERS, who has given many years of service here, though he is a very busy Member in other activities; the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROGERS]; the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. SKEEN]; and the gentleman from Massachusetts, Mr. SILVIO CONTE. I wish to pay special tribute to my colleagues who work on this subcommittee because they, too, recognize agriculture as basic to the overall economy and to the public's well-being.

Mrs. SMITH of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to my good friend and colleague, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MYERS].

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleague, the gentleman from Nebraska, for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Chairman, it is a pleasure to serve on this committee, not just for the task we have in trying to help rural American agriculture but for the colleagues we have to serve with and the staff that we have.

As Chairman WHITTEN and the gentlewoman from Nebraska [Mrs. SMITH] have both demonstrated here, the spirit is that we want to try to help rural America. It is a rather difficult job, but we do it in a bipartisan way—I guess I should say "nonpartisan" because there is a difference between bipartisan and nonpartisan. We do it in a nonpartisan way because the problems in rural America today are too important to let politics enter into it.

I just took this off the ticker here. Contract lows were established in every pit in the grain market in Chicago at the close today. At the close, soybeans were off up to 5¢ cents; wheat

was off up to 6 cents, 6 to 8 cents; corn was off up to 3¼ cents; and oats were off 2¼ cents. This is happening too often. The market is continuing to go down.

If you will look at the report—and I know there is a lot of reading in these committee reports—on pages 10, 11, and 12 it pretty well tells the story about agriculture and rural America and its plight. If you will read it, it says that prices received by farmers have gone up roughly 50 percent in the last 10 years; that is, on overall prices, while prices paid by farmers have more than doubled. The pressure is on farmers to produce better today and cheaper, and it is not always possible.

This bill is a rather comprehensive bill. It is unfortunate that so often some of our colleagues point to the \$33 billion figure here in this appropriation and say: "Look, a \$33 billion handout to farmers of America for sitting on their cans and going to Florida," or whatever it is farmers are accused of. And that is not true.

If you would closely examine our appropriation bill today, you will see that more than 60 percent of this \$33 billion is not related to help to farmers directly; it is in feeding programs such as the Child Nutrition Program, \$4 billion plus; women, infants, and children, \$1.5 billion; and food stamps, almost \$12 billion. Those are three of the largest items in our appropriation bill.

So maybe it is a little unfair that farmers get tagged today about this huge appropriation, that we are bailing out farmers or paying farmers not to work, which is not true.

But it is a big bill. I must say that in the years I have been on the Appropriations Committee this bill has increased rather significantly. But again it has not been in helping farmers do a better job or paying farmers not to produce or providing for the many programs that so often farmers get accused of. So much of it has been in feeding programs and in research. And research is very necessary.

The bill is under every expectation. It is below the President's request by approximately \$22 million, not a large amount under the President's request, but it is under the President's request. It is well under last year's spending on appropriations.

The Members are all going to receive letters, as we already have, from the Office of Management and Budget. I would be kind of disappointed and be suspect if we did not get a letter from OMB saying that the bill is not acceptable to the administration. It troubles me to get those letters because it is the scoring, how it is done. We have examined this, and what actually happens is that every time the Appropriations Committee makes a savings and cuts below the President's request,

that is never taken off, but every time we change in priorities, adjust the dollars from the President's request, if we add to it, that is a plus. That is charged against us in their scorekeeping. But when we cut below, which we did a number of times, we are never given credit. So the OMB makes the best of their world to make their case look the best. They add it up, they add to it and charge us if we go over their expenditures, but they never give us credit for the cuts.

As long as I have been on the Appropriations Committee—and the chairman has been there a long time, much longer than I have, as well as several other members, including the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. NATCHER], who has been there many years longer than I—the House of Representatives and the other body, especially the Appropriations Committees, are going to see things differently from the administration. And we should. That is our job. If we have to rubber stamp only what somebody else requests, why have the Appropriations Committee? Why have a House of Representatives? Why have a Congress at all?

Of course we make some adjustments. We live with it. We examine each of these programs, and we make judgments on what is best for rural America because we are closer to it.

We have made some changes. But this is the bottom line which I think we have to be concerned about here. We have the House-passed budget, which is someplace between here and the other side—and whether it will ever see the light of day we do not know—and we can only take that document and last year's spending and the President's request. We are under all of them in this bill.

Mr. Chairman, this is a bill worthy of the Members' support.

□ 1610

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to point out the situation we have facing us and the basis for our bill that we have here.

Mr. Chairman, Members are well aware of the conditions facing American agriculture. Not a day goes by without the press reporting on the seriousness of the situation. Bankruptcies are prevalent, and loss of farms that have been in a family for generations is commonplace.

What is equally disturbing is the recommendation for a new farm bill submitted by the administration which would reduce farm income further, would reduce production, and do nothing to reduce costs to the farmer nor to pass on a reasonable price to the user of farm products.

Why don't we let the user pay for a reasonable support price for basic commodities. It would be many times cheaper to the Government and would prevent the farmers from an unde-

served tag of being kept citizens. At the beginning of the year, we would remove to a great degree the uncertainty of price. Industry and labor pass on to the users what they get under laws—through such laws as minimum wage, the right of labor to organize and of industry to mark up so much above cost. Over the last 25 years these two have increased their take of the user's dollar from 49 percent to 73 percent. The farmer buying from them has an ever-increasing cost and decreasing income, declining from 51 percent to 27 percent during the same period.

What we pay to him is to offset the increase of what the other two have gotten. As with industry and labor, the farmer should receive a fair return.

In export sales, we have to deal with foreign governments. Why don't we use the Commodity Credit Corporation, a wholly owned Government corporation set up for the very purpose of dealing with foreign governments? It worked before, why not use it now? All countries sell what they produce and don't need for what it will bring except the United States. Why should we hold an umbrella over world prices and remain a residual supplier because we don't push for our normal share of world markets?

If the Secretary rents 20 million acres of land, at a cost of \$11 billion charged to the farmer, actually he will give away a further share of our overseas market as he did when he lost 11 percent with the PIK Program.

Without meaning to, they would cause a return to Dust Bowl days. At a time when farmers are broke, they put the burden on him to take care of the land when he cannot even pay his taxes.

Recommended are programs paying him a slight sum not to farm which have the effect of giving our competitors our normal foreign markets. At a time when much of the world is hungry it is proposed we limit our production.

It is evident we are returning to the conditions of the early 1930's when no farmer owned his land. It was owned by insurance companies and banks.

Under some proposals Federal agents will be authorized to go on a person's land to enforce orders of the Federal Government in Washington. Not just to search out illegal crops like marijuana, but to see if farmers are carrying out the orders of the Secretary of Agriculture.

With our trade deficit over \$120 billion a year, our national debt nearly \$2 trillion, the Nation cannot afford a return to Dust Bowl days.

All farmers know land deteriorates far more if idle than if cultivated. Today nonfarmers appear to be in the saddle in setting agricultural policy.

For those who would do what the budget advocates, let them do it by State law and not by Federal statute or program.

FORMER PROGRAMS EFFECTIVE

Mr. Chairman, few are aware of or have taken the time to study the history of the farm programs. The farm programs were originally enacted by the Congress to restore purchasing power to agriculture. For years, we in this country provided a domestic support price by loan or purchase to maintain a reasonable balance between the income of agriculture, industry and labor.

The Commodity Credit Corporation, a \$25 billion wholly owned Government corporation, was set up to support such a system. The CCC charter provided the authority and obligation to support farm prices through commodity loans and purchases at prices which provide a balance to the farmer at a level comparable to labor and industry; and move supplies surplus to domestic needs into world trade at competitive prices, with credit arrangements comparable to those provided for other U.S. products.

This approach had the advantage of letting the farmer and his banker know what price levels they could count on when he planted his crop—leaving cost and volume as the only variables. It provided a strong and well-financed mechanism to sell commodities surplus to domestic needs in world trade on a competitive basis. It also enabled the farmer to deal through a Government corporation on an equal basis with other governments, most of which use governmental boards or agencies to market their production.

Another benefit of this system—and a substantial one—was that the price paid to maintain a reasonable balance for the farmer came from the users of his products, who on the domestic level paid at least the support price which assured the farmer of a fair return on his production. In this connection, it should be recognized that a 10-percent increase in farm prices would add less than half a cent to the retail price of a 54-cent loaf of bread and only 5 cents to the retail price of a \$15.95 cotton shirt.

Under this program, farmers imposed on themselves acreage allotments which applied to most basic or storable commodities. However, in 1956, this approach fell into disuse. Few people today remember it, and few study the past. At that time Congress had to step in and require the use of CCC to move our commodities in world markets at competitive prices.

Perishable commodities, where one year's surplus generally does not carry over into the next year, were and still are supported by section 32 funds—30 percent of tariff receipts on imports. These funds are used to buy up sur-

pluses for use in the School Lunch Program, feeding programs for the needy, and other such outlets. Unfortunately, in recent years there have been attempts in Congress to transfer cash directly rather than commodities or to divert the fund to other uses, thereby defeating the intent of the program and its essential price support benefits.

This farm program worked.

It provided relatively stable income to the farmer. It preserved our share of world markets, since our competitors knew that the United States would produce and sell, with the receipts going back into the CCC revolving fund for continued use.

It is still in basic law.

It is not a two-price system. A two-price system is one which results in one price to the farmer for production for the domestic market, and another price to the farmer for production for export. Use of CCC to support prices and sell surpluses overseas competitively involves only one price to the farmer for his entire production.

This concept has now been twisted around by opponents to discredit the former farm program—one which worked.

It should be recognized that support prices and competitive export sales do not represent a subsidy to the farmer. Rather, they are used to protect his market, and thus are a benefit to the entire economy. They enable the American consumer to enjoy abundant quantities of high quality food at very low prices and enable American industry to retain its largest and best customer—the farmer.

CONSERVATION OF NATURAL RESOURCES

Mr. Chairman, one of the most disturbing aspects of the proposed 1986 budget is its virtual abandonment of the Department of Agriculture's conservation programs. Next year's budget proposes to reduce the funds and staff of the Soil Conservation Service to one-third of its present level. It eliminates all funding for the Agricultural Conservation Program [ACP] and the Forestry Incentives Programs. It removes all funds of river basin surveys and investigations, watershed planning, watershed and flood prevention, resource conservation and development, and Great Plains conservation, all of which have contributed so much to the Nation's conservation movement.

These proposals raise several basic questions which can be answered by Congress and the people, such as: Can this country afford to step aside and let the very effective conservation effort built up over past 50 years disintegrate? Can we let up on our efforts to prevent the depletion of our soil, and timber resources at a time when expanding needs for food and fiber at home and abroad are placing increased demands on the productive capacity of

this country? Can we expect the farmer to assume the full cost of protecting and conserving the land for present and future generations, when he is unable to even meet the interest payments on his loan? Can we ignore the mistakes of those civilizations which have disappeared or are in the process of disappearing because of failure to protect and preserve their productive resources?

LESSONS OF THE PAST

A review of history reveals what happened to those past civilizations of the world which failed to take care of their fertile lands, timber, and water supplies.

Today's terrible famine in Africa is a present-day example of the results of the failures to employ good conservation practices. Here again, the major reason for this calamity is the neglect of the soil, water, and timber resources through the years. The lack of rain during the past 3 years has brought on the immediate crisis. However, continued deforestation, soil degradation, population growth, and counterproductive Government policies have contributed to the long-term decline in the productivity of the past half-century, have done so much to restore and preserve the Nation's basic natural resources and the growing human suffering which follows.

Our people and our Government must ever be aware of the need to maintain a strong and coordinated conservation effort. They must realize that the best investment they can make in the future of this country is the conservation of its real wealth—the soil, the water, and the timber. With productive resources, present generations can feed themselves and pass along to their children the means to prosper during their lifetime. With wornout land and depleted water supplies, their descendants cannot survive, despite all else.

STRONG CONGRESSIONAL SUPPORT

Mr. Chairman, through the years, this committee has believed that it is absolutely essential to maintain the conservation programs of the Department of Agriculture at a level which will ensure maximum protection of the Nation's basic resources. With the backing of the Congress through the years, it has restored severe budget reductions and has increased budget requests to assure an effective national conservation effort. It has restored budget cuts for the agricultural conservation program [ACP] more than 30 times over the years.

The committee can see no reason to turn its back on these valuable programs now, as proposed by the 1986 budget. It cannot see the logic of giving less attention to the foundation of our national economy, so as to spend more for less productive purposes.

CREDIT ASSISTANCE REDUCED

The proposed budget for 1986 seriously curtails insured loan funds for the Farmers Home Administration which provides loan funds to those farmers who are unable to obtain credit from other sources. This proposal would also eliminate almost 4,000 staff technicians from FmHA offices at a time when farmers are facing the most severe financial crisis since the Great Depression and need additional assistance in meeting their problems, not less. Many farmers are in deep financial trouble. Many are facing bankruptcy. Many are unable to plant their crops for the next year.

PHASEOUT OF REA AND FCIC SUPPORT

The 1986 budget also proposes to severely curtail various USDA programs which have done so much to improve the quality of life in rural America. It drastically reduces funds for the Rural Electrification and Telephone Programs—the first step toward eventual liquidation of these valuable programs which have been so successful in bringing essential electric and telephone services to rural areas. Also, it sharply reduces loan and grant funds for water and sewer facilities and rural housing. Further, under proposed legislation, the administration would phase out Federal administrative and premium support for the Federal Crop Insurance Program. This would increase the farmer's crop insurance premiums at a time when he is unable to assume any additional expenses. About 80 percent of the land area of our country, four times the area in our major cities and encompasses thousands of cities and towns. This area of the country and its residents must have equal treatment.

FARM ECONOMY CONTINUES TO DECLINE

Although the Nation's total economy has expanded greatly through the years, the farm economy has declined. Since 1968, the Gross National Product (GNP) has increased 331 percent, from \$831 billion in 1968 to \$3,581 billion in 1984. During this same period, net farm income went up only half that amount—152 percent, from \$12.3 billion in 1968 to an estimated \$31.0 billion in 1984.

While the national income level rose from \$722.5 billion in 1968 to \$2,450 billion in 1982—an increase of 240 percent—income to the farm sector went up only one-third of that amount—80 percent. During the period, gross farm income doubled while farm production expenses tripled, leaving a greatly decreased share for the farmer.

FARM INCOME

During the past decade, gross farm income increased 70 percent while farm production expenses went up 90 percent, leaving less net income to the producer. Net income reached a high of \$31 billion in 1981, but then dropped nearly 50 percent to a low of \$16 billion in 1983.

During the hearings on the 1986 budget, the Secretary of Agriculture estimated that net farm income for 1985 will be between \$19 and \$24 billion—a reduction of \$10 billion from 1984 and close to the disastrously low level of 1983.

FARMER'S SHARE OF FOOD DOLLAR

Since 1946, the farmer's share of the dollar has decreased nearly 50 percent, from 51 percent to 27 percent, while the share taken by those between the farmer and the consumer has nearly doubled, from 49 percent to 73 percent. Thus, while the farmer's income has gone down, the cost of what he must buy from industry and labor has gone up, leaving less and less for him to run his farm and support his family.

FARM DEBT A GROWING PROBLEM

Mr. Chairman, as of January 1, 1985, the farm debt totaled \$212 billion—an increase of \$159 billion—300 percent—over 1970. About half the debt is for real estate loans, the balance covers non-real estate and CCC loans. This is a very heavy debtload for the farmers to carry under today's depressed farm conditions and high interest rates.

Due to loss of income on one hand and inflated expenses on the other, an increasing number of farm producers are existing from one crop year to the next entirely on credit. Many have had to mortgage all of their assets each year to plant their next crop. They are in effect working for their bankers, since they have no equity left. Many remain on the farm only because they prefer farming as a way of life, not as a way to support their families.

FAMILY FARMS IN TROUBLE

Large farms units—those with annual sales of \$500,000 or more—and small farms which depend largely on off-farm income are relatively solvent. The current debt crisis is affecting primarily the family farms with annual sales of \$40,000 to \$500,000, which provide an important part of the Nation's supplies of food and fiber. About 229,000—34 percent—of these middle-size farms with debt-to-asset ratios of 40 percent or more are in serious financial trouble, many facing bankruptcy. Those in the deepest trouble are located in the Corn Belt, Lake States, and Northern Plains.

FALLING LAND VALUES

Declining farm income, and falling land values reflecting the reduced earning power of farmland, are largely responsible for the present credit crisis. The value of farm real estate which provides the main collateral to support farm loans has declined 10 percent since 1981. In the Corn Belt land values have fallen 30 to 50 percent. As a result, many farmers face bankruptcy and many more are unable to put this year's crop into the ground at planting time.

LOAN DELINQUENCIES AND LOSSES

Loan delinquencies of the Farmers Home Administration, which holds 9 percent of farm real estate debt and 15 percent of farm operating debt, are at an alltime high. As of April 1985, 41 percent of its borrowers were delinquent some \$5.4 billion.

Also, the Farm Credit System is under financial stress; 11 production credit associations PCA's have been liquidated and 39 PCA's have been merged to maintain liquidity. In 1983, PCA losses totaled \$253 million, over 40 percent of all losses sustained in its 50-year history. Losses increased to \$370 million in 1984, a serious strain on PCA reserves.

The Governor of the Farm Credit Administration summed it up in the following words: "In my 8 years of coming before you . . . this is an extremely critical year. PCA's and Federal land banks are facing serious cash flow problems. The next 2 to 3 years are crucial."

IMPACT ON RURAL AND URBAN AMERICA

Mr. Chairman, the impact of the current farm crisis on rural America is growing as increasing numbers of producers are being forced off their farms. Equipment dealers, hardware stores, feed, seed, and fertilizer dealers, and many Main Street merchants in small, rural towns are going broke along with the farmer.

Rural banks, which represent 28 percent of all U.S. banks, are also in trouble. An increasing number are facing bankruptcy. As of January 1, 1985, 837 of the Nation's banks were considered by the FDIC to be problem banks. Of these, 306—37 percent—were agricultural or rural banks with 25 percent of their loans agriculture-related.

The media is full of examples of rural communities which are beginning to dry up, especially in the Midwest. Press and TV provide a frightening picture of the threat to the agricultural heartland of the United States—an area which has helped greatly to feed the entire world. They provide ample evidence of what can happen to the national economy if its foundation—agriculture—crumbles.

URBAN PEOPLE ALSO AFFECTED

People in the cities are also beginning to feel the impact of the farm crisis. Companies which provide the equipment and supplies needed to operate the farms and produce the crops are having to curtail their operations and reduce the number of their employees.

FUTURE OF AMERICAN AGRICULTURE

Despite agriculture's magnificent contribution to the strength of the United States and the welfare of its people, the future of the family farm which made this possible is not encouraging. Faulty Government policies, failure to protect the farmer's interest, and lack of official and public

understanding and support have made farming a far less desirable and rewarding occupation and way of life than in the past.

Only about 3 percent of our people live on the farm today. The other 97 percent, who enjoy the highest standard of living ever known to man, take their food supply for granted. They often fail to realize that the farmer must have a fair return for his investment and labor if he is to continue to provide their basic necessities—food, clothing, and shelter. Many overlook the fact that the low food prices they enjoy in this country come at the expense of the farmer who must face ever-expanding production costs with a declining share of the consumer food dollar.

FARM VALUE OF FOOD DOWN

For the wheat in a 54-cent loaf of bread or the corn in a 56-cent package of cornflakes, the farmer receives only 4 cents. The farm value of the cotton in a \$15.95 shirt is only 50 cents, about 3 percent of the retail price. If the farm price of wheat and cotton were increased by 10 percent, it would add less than half a cent to the retail price of a loaf of bread and only 5 cents to the retail price of a cotton shirt.

AGRICULTURE—NATION'S LARGEST INDUSTRY

Mr. Chairman, agriculture is the Nation's main generator of new wealth. It is estimated that each dollar taken from the soil multiplies seven times as it travels through the Nation's financial system. In 1982, agriculture accounted for 19.8 percent of gross national product, compared with 5.1 percent for the auto industry and 2.6 percent for housing.

Agriculture is the country's largest industry. Its assets of over \$1 trillion are equal to 70 percent of the total for all manufacturing corporations in the United States. Some 22 million people work in some phase of agriculture, from growing food and fiber to selling it at the supermarket or the export market. The number of such workers equals the combined total for transportation, the steel industry, and the automobile industry.

For the benefit of all—farmer, consumer, industry, and labor—the importance of agriculture to our society and our economy must be recognized and perpetuated. The American farmer must have equal opportunity under the law to maintain a balance with all other segments of the Nation's economy. The future strength and prosperity of this country depends on this.

Mrs. SMITH of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to my good friend, the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. SKEEN].

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding this time.

I want to begin by saying that as a new member on the Agriculture Appropriations Committee that it has

been very instructional. I have served on the full Agriculture Committee of the House prior to going to this assignment.

I want to say at the outset that under the adroit leadership of our chairman, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN], and in concert with our colleagues and with good staff representation as well, I think it is probably one of the most responsive committees that I have ever served on, because we are in a crisis in agriculture. I do not think that anyone would deny that who knows what the situation is or who has had any contact with it.

For most Americans, that is a very superficial contact because so few people today are involved directly in agriculture. Just a little over 3 percent of our entire population produces the food and fiber that we use in this country. We are so sophisticated that lots of times we take this for granted, because it is there and in abundant supply, it is well packaged, it is attractive, and it is there once again in great abundance.

As a matter of fact, that has been one of our problems, the tremendous abundance that we produce in agriculture goods in the United States.

But I do want to say this, at this time we do have an economic crisis in agriculture, that this committee has risen to the challenge each time. I want to commend the chairman and the other members of the committee, as well as the staff, because just the other day we extended the CCC authority. The initiative was begun here and I think that took care of a situation that could have been very costly for farmers, particularly in the winter wheat producing country, because without that authority the sales would have completely stopped, the cash flow which is so essential in operating agricultural enterprises today would have been stopped.

Along with that I want to mention, too, and everybody gets a little grin out of this when you mention it, the grasshopper program, but an extremely critical issue to many of the States in the West and the Northwest. This committee once again rose to that challenge and took care of that problem in a timely fashion ahead of the incident itself, because the hatch looked good.

So I just want to take this opportunity to say it has been a pleasure to serve on that committee. I think we have done very valuable work. I think we have got a good agriculture appropriation bill here today.

One of the things that it is is forward looking. It is saying that we have a tremendous future in agriculture, no matter how dark the situation may look today. We are still going to take care of agricultural research and the conservation measures that we feel are

one of our primary responsibilities and that is included in this bill today, not just farm credit, not just the economic things, but the future of agriculture in the United States.

I want to commend the members of the committee and those members of the staff who served with us. It has been a real pleasure to operate with them.

I think we have a good bill here and I urge its adoption.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the ranking member of the committee, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. TRAXLER].

Mr. TRAXLER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in complete support of H.R. 3037, the bill making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and related agencies for fiscal 1986. This bill deserves the support of all of our colleagues because it is fiscally prudent while meeting the many important diverse needs of those who depend upon the programs administered by the Department of Agriculture.

I want to compliment the distinguished chairman of both the full Appropriations Committee and the Agriculture Subcommittee, Mr. WHITTEN, for his marvelous leadership in a very difficult task. I also want to express my appreciation to our distinguished ranking minority member, Mrs. SMITH of Nebraska, who consistently puts the interest of American agriculture first, and enables us to come forward with a truly bipartisan bill.

There is no question that American agriculture continues to face great difficulties. The work on this appropriation, as well as the work on the 1985 farm bill clearly reflect our concern that something must be done to address the serious problems our farmers face so that we can continue to have the most abundant food supply in the world.

I must say at this point, however, that I am somewhat disheartened by the fact that despite that our action was completed last week on an emergency supplemental appropriation for the Commodity Credit Corporation to keep farm price support payments coming, the President has as of late yesterday still not signed the measure into law. This is certainly an urgent situation, and I would implore the President to recognize this fact on this bill and any further supplemental action we might have to take.

Mr. Chairman, the bill before us today is \$4.2 billion below the fiscal 1985 appropriation for the Department of Agriculture. It is also slightly below the amount requested by the President in total, while responding to the concerns of the hundreds of witnesses who appeared before our subcommittee during our 2 months of hearings. The priorities may not be the same as those in the President's

budget, but they are in keeping with what the people we all represent say they want.

I want to take some time here to describe some of the programs that are of particular significance to the people I represent, and, indeed, to our entire Nation.

We have heard a lot about efforts by the Environmental Protection Agency to ban leaded gasoline over the next few years. Last year as part of our work on the HUD-independent agencies appropriations bill, the report directed EPA to review the adverse effects of such a ban on farmers who frequently own older vehicles that use leaded gasoline. The ban will provide a particular hardship to them. The full Appropriations Committee last week directed EPA to work with the Secretary of Agriculture to conduct a study of the use of leaded fuel in gasoline engines used in agricultural machinery to analyze mechanical difficulties associated with the use of other fuels, and the impact of a ban on leaded fuels on farmers. We expect the Secretary of Agriculture to take close note of this directive which is found in House Report 99-212, and sanctioned during our discussions of the agricultural appropriations bill.

There is no question that the future of agriculture depends in large part upon the results of research and extension activities. This is why, in my view, these programs deserve special consideration in any budget. They are plans for the future, and we are all interested in the future.

It was necessary for us to make several restorations in these accounts. The cuts were not in the best interest of our Nation. The restorations are. But we did not provide any major increases in these accounts either, recognizing the fiscal limitations our Nation faces.

It is particularly important to those of us around the Great Lakes to have the restoration of \$200,000 for the continued assessment of dioxin and other contaminants in the Great Lakes. We need to be vigilant about all dangers from chemical residues, and it is vital that we do more to understand the possible health risks of these substances before they enter the food chain.

For the Cooperative State Research Service, we were forced to make some hard choices. The hardest one we had to make was to not provide for an increase in the Hatch Act formula research funds. This action is in line with the President's budget proposal, and is also consistent with our action throughout the entire bill. I know that many State research stations are in need of additional research funds, and I truly wish that the time was right to provide an adequate increase, but that is one of the good things that will have to wait while we in the House

make serious efforts to reduce the Federal budget deficit.

We were able to restore a number of special research grants that are of special interest to Michigan, including funding for the Saginaw Valley Bean and Beet Research Farm, dairy and beef photoperiod research, blueberry shoestring virus research, potato research, asparagus yield decline research, stone fruit decline research, and wood utilization research.

I want to call special attention to the wood utilization research project which involves a cooperative effort between Michigan State University and Purdue University. Given the extensive forest lands in Michigan, it is important that adequate work be done to appropriately use and replenish a significant resource.

We were also able to fund four new research projects under the Special Research Grants Program this year. One of these projects will provide \$100,000 for the initiation of an apple quality research program in Michigan. This project is designed to improve apple quality at the level of production, handling, storage, packaging, and distribution. Work will also be done regarding grading, sorting, and packaging of apples.

We reduced funding for the Competitive Grant Program by \$12 million, from \$46 to \$34 million. Since this funding involves totally new projects each year and these projects are usually not of an emergency nature, it is possible to reduce this funding without impairing the ability to do crucial research.

We also did not provide any increase in Smith-Lever formula funding under the Extension Service. Our reasoning here was the same as with Hatch funding under CSRS. I personally would have preferred increasing this account, but our budget situation does not allow us our personal preferences.

We did manage, however, to restore the shortsighted efforts to eliminate funding for all of the Smith-Lever 3(d) projects, like the Expanded Food and Nutrition Education Program, the Farm Safety Program, the Urban Gardening Program, and the Integrated Pest Management Program. The strong public support for these efforts would not allow us in good conscience to go along with the President's recommendation to eliminate funding for these projects.

I am sorry, however, that we were not able to restore funding for the Renewable Resources Extension Program. I personally understand the importance of this program, and I am very hopeful that in the remainder of the budget process we might find a way to restore funding for this program.

We were also able to restore a number of reductions proposed for the Animal and Plant Health Inspection

Service. Of primary importance is the restoration of funding for the Brucellosis Eradication Program. It seems as if this is a battle we face each year because certain individuals are simply philosophically opposed to this program. Fortunately the Appropriations Committee is more interested in results, and it is based on the success of this program, as well as the remaining task, that we restored funding.

Another battle we face each year involves funding for the Animal Welfare Program. The amount of mail I have received in support of restoring funds for this program is absolutely incredible. Each year during our hearings I have been able to point out to APHIS personnel that the law does not allow States and private organizations to enforce the provisions of the Animal Welfare Act, as the administration persistently proposes. The results of adopting any reduction in funding for this program would quite simply mean that our animal welfare efforts would be significantly diminished.

I am also pleased that we were able to restore funding for the Agricultural Cooperative Service. We understand quite well that this agency is doing all that it can with its limited resources to help foster the development and expansion of farmer cooperatives. This is support that is vitally needed as we work to help expand market opportunities for our farmers.

In title II, we restored a great number of rural loan and grant programs, both for farmers and for communities. Now is not the time to cut off the resource helping so many farmers stay in production, and all of these programs have a role to play in this regard. We cannot afford to forget the programs that serve rural communities, like water and sewer programs, because the quality of life in rural areas is just as important as it is in urban areas.

We also restored funding for the Rural Electrification Administration, compared to the President's request. The funding is below the fiscal 1985 levels in some of the REA programs in recognition of our tight budget situation, and reflects the best estimates of actual needs for the REA programs. I want to extend my personal compliments to the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association for their sincerity in working toward funding recommendations which meet both the needs of rural areas and Federal budget constraints. Let no one say that this group was more interested in its own concerns than in our Nation.

We also rejected some extremely disastrous proposals to reduce total funding for the Soil Conservation Service by about one-third. The job of conservation is never over because the forces of nature continue to work on changing our resources, and all too often in-

dividuals fail to recognize the need to work with and not against nature. The Soil Conservation Service works to help everyone develop this understanding.

I am particularly pleased that we were able to provide \$60,000 to start a study of back irrigation through existing drainage systems to avoid the need for taking water from ground wells for irrigation purposes in the Thumb and Saginaw Bay area of Michigan. This project will serve as a model for the Nation in demonstrating a new and innovative way to provide water for our farmers while taking action to avoid risks to water supplies.

And it should be no surprise to anyone that we once again restored funding for the most basic of all conservation programs, the Agricultural Conservation Program. The local nature of this program enables every part of the Nation to tailor conservation practices to individual situations. The continued efforts to eliminate this program have failed once again because we continue to recognize the value of ACP, and the fact that the job is not yet done.

Title III provide all of the funding for our domestic feeding programs. In a Nation as rich as ours, we have a moral obligation to try to share our abundance with those who do not have the personal ability to obtain adequate food for themselves and their families.

It is true that this is a very major component of this appropriation bill, and it is equally true that these programs face the same budget limitations that I described for other components of the bill. We have operated under a very simple and straightforward policy in developing this component of the bill: We fund programs based on current provisions of law, and we do so to our best ability so that no one need be removed from a program unnecessarily. We know that there are changes proposed for the various feeding programs, both in H.R. 7 and in the farm bill title dealing with Food Stamps and the Commodity Supplemental Feeding Program. But we do not know the final design of these modifications because neither of these measures has received full consideration by the House and Senate, and we cannot responsibly base our funding on uncertain provisions.

In many areas the President's budget request understates the funding requirements for these programs. We have allowed for this fact by providing certain increases over the budget request, while holding these increases to the maximum necessary to meet current service requirements.

As I have in the past, I want to call particular attention to the section of this title which provides funding for the Commodity Supplemental Feeding Program. We have provided an in-

crease of \$2,950,000 in this program to account for the continuation of three projects providing commodities to low income elderly individuals in Detroit, MI, New Orleans, LA, and Des Moines, IA. This dollar amount reflects the best information we could obtain regarding the cost of continuing these programs, and the bill allows for not less than this amount in the event that these cost projects are revised at a later date. We have rejected the proposal to transfer this project to the Department of Health and Human Services, because such transfer would be contrary to the historic method of operating this program and would impair its efficiency.

In our report we direct the Department to include timely information in its monthly report, "Food Program Update", so that we and the public can be kept fully apprised of the operation of this program. It is amazing to me that while data on all other feeding programs is regularly included in this document, information on CSFP is available only on a sporadic basis. It is also most interesting that while program operators are required to report program participation levels at the end of each month, it is nearly 3 months before any of this information is included in the monthly update when information is provided. This is simply not an acceptable situation, and there is no good reason whatsoever for the Department not to revise its policy regarding the reporting of the operation of the Commodity Supplemental Feeding Program.

We are also faced with a much more serious issue regarding the administration of this program by the Food and Nutrition Service, and the Office of Management and Budget. We are nearly 10 months through fiscal 1985, and OMB has yet to approve the actual fiscal 1985 allocation for this program. Local operators have been operating under fiscal 1984 guidelines, which does allow them to continue to operate, but failure to act responsibly with this budget allocation makes it virtually impossible for us to determine the true extent of interest in this program in relationship to the ability of the agency to respond. Four applications have been submitted for new programs by the States of Arizona, New Mexico, New York, and Rhode Island. These applications were rejected because the agency claims that there is not sufficient money to start these programs. But we do not know this for a fact because the allocations have not been officially completed, and also because the agency is planning on using fiscal 1985 funds to purchase food that will be used in fiscal 1986. While this may not be illegal, it is certainly a breach of faith regarding the fact that the money for this program is appropriated with the intent that it be used in the year for which it

is appropriated—not for the next fiscal year.

But we cannot act in a vacuum. We need information, and we will do all that we can to get it. This is in part why our report directs the agency to keep us advised regarding the status of any application for the Commodity Supplemental Food Program. That means we want to know when applications are filed, where they are filed, what the decision is, how long it has taken, and to the extent that an application is rejected that the reason be clearly and explicitly stated. We also expect that to the extent additional appropriations are needed to deal with legitimate demand for the program that the Department will request supplementals, and not merely say funds are insufficient to approve additional applications.

There is also an important report directive regarding utility allowances for the Food Stamp Program. We direct the Department to allow States to continue to follow the practice of using a standard utility allowance. This is administratively easier, and there has not been an opportunity for full consideration of any changes in this policy. The Department should not be able to move forward with the change that it has proposed without congressional approval because this issue is so important. I expect we will hear more about this issue in the days ahead.

I am also pleased that we are providing \$50 million for the Temporary Emergency Food Assistance Program. This program is too important to too many people to allow it to lapse, and it is for this reason that we are providing funding under the terms of the rule. We do so in advance of the authorization which has already been approved by the full House Agriculture Committee as part of the 1985 farm bill.

Title IV provides funding for our international agricultural programs. Funding for the Foreign Agricultural Service is essentially at fiscal 1985 levels, and will allow the agency to continue its extremely important market development cooperator program.

Funding is also provided for the Food for Peace Program, Public Law 480. This is an extremely important program, and is a part of the worldwide governmental and private efforts to provide needed food assistance to the hungry around the world. Let me emphasize that Public Law 480 is available for all needy people around the world, and is not restricted to our immediate concerns for the people of Africa.

As we have in the past, I am confident that we will respond to developing circumstances around the world, and promptly consider all supplemental appropriation requests for this program that may be warranted.

We have also provided certain directives to the Department of Agriculture to expand its use of beans in brine as part of the Food for Peace Programs. This processed commodity has been demonstrated to the private relief organizations and Agency for International Development personnel in Africa, and has met with great approval. Unfortunately, the Department of Agriculture has not moved quickly enough to approve this item as one of those eligible for the Public Law 480 program. We need to have the Department recognize that cost is not the only nor the controlling issue in our efforts to provide essential food assistance to those in need. Beans in brine meet an important nutrition test, and can go a long way in helping ease the problems of hunger. The same is true of ultra-high-temperature milk, and we would expect the Department to move to expand use of these important food items.

Mr. Chairman, obviously this bill covers a large range of programs of interest to all of our colleagues. I urge their support of the fiscal 1986 agriculture appropriations bill.

Mrs. SMITH of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LOEFFLER] for a colloquy with our chairman, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN].

Mr. LOEFFLER. Mr. Chairman, I thank my distinguished ranking member for yielding to me.

I would like to ask the chairman of the committee to participate in a colloquy with me.

On page 34 of our committee report, the following table reflects the committee's recommendations on special research grants. In this committee report, there is a recommendation that no money be made available for Wool Research, which is a research facility near San Angelo, TX. As I have spoken with the chairman, it is my understanding that \$150,000 will be made available and it was frankly an oversight.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, that is correct. I am sorry it was overlooked. It was not recommended by the Office of Management and Budget, but that is true of most of these programs in this bill. Most programs were restored by the Congress. I am in thorough accord with the gentleman from Texas and I expect to see that Wool Research is restored in conference.

Mr. LOEFFLER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the distinguished gentleman and I thank the distinguished ranking minority leader on our committee for their help and assistance.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to a member of the subcommittee, the gentleman from New York [Mr. McHUGH].

Mr. McHUGH. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of this appropriations bill, and urge my colleagues to vote for it. Under the fine leadership of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN], this bill has been fashioned so that it protects our resources and our commitments to the people of this Nation. At the same time, the bill is below the fiscal year 1985 appropriation level. This was not an easy task. However, it was accomplished due to the work and cooperation of all of the members of our subcommittee and its capable staff.

I think the bill is a balanced one. Despite the need for fiscal restraint, it addresses the basic needs of our farmers, the problems of our rural communities, and the nutritional needs of the most vulnerable of our society, our children, and the elderly. In addition, the bill provides funds for international programs of relief and cooperation.

This appropriations bill provides funds for education through extension programs, for research on food and fiber, for export development, and for protection of our natural resources, soil and watersheds. All of these programs are vital to sustaining our farmers who face a most difficult time economically. The application of new research and the development of new techniques are important to our agricultural base. Clearly, we must protect those resources that are not replaceable such as land and water. The continuation of these programs is necessary if we are to remain the breadbasket for the world.

For rural communities, the bill provides funds to continue programs such as rural housing, water and sewer loans and grants, and rural electrification and telephone service. There are just a few of the programs that help to foster a sound economy in our small and medium sized communities.

In meeting our responsibilities to those in need of nutrition assistance, the bill continues funds for the school lunch program, the food stamp program, all child nutrition programs and the special food program for women, infants and children [WIC]. The bill contains sufficient funds to maintain these programs at current service levels.

In the international area, programs such as Public Law 480 are also maintained at the fiscal year 1985 levels. However, this is one area that may need further attention given the continuing crisis in Africa. We may well need to consider additional funds for famine relief once we have reasonably reliable estimates on the food needs and actions necessary to continue to respond to this tragic situation.

I would especially like to have my colleagues note that the Committee provided direction to the Office of International Cooperation and Development to develop the Foreign Associ-

ate Expert Program. The committee expects OICD to work with other agencies to appoint recent science graduates to the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations so that they may gain international experience. This should benefit our Nation as well as others. We expect OICD to see that four or five graduates are made available to the FAO for at least 2 years.

On the whole, I think the bill is a responsible one. The restorations that we made in program funding levels simply maintain current services in most instances. It is not an extravagant spending bill, and it deserves our support.

The CHAIRMAN. The Committee will rise informally in order that the House may receive a message.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

The Speaker pro tempore [Mr. McHUGH] assumed the chair.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will receive a message.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Saunders, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on the following dates the President approved and signed a bill and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles:

On July 17, 1985:

H.J. Res. 325. Joint resolution to designate July 13, 1985, as "Live Aid Day."

On July 19, 1985:

H.R. 1373. An act to designate the wilderness in the Point Reyes National Seashore in California as the Phillip Burton Wilderness.

On July 22, 1985:

H.J. Res. 198. Joint resolution providing for appointment of Barnabas McHenry as a citizen regent of the Smithsonian Institution.

On July 24, 1985:

H.J. Res. 342. Joint resolution making an urgent supplemental appropriation for the fiscal year September 30, 1985, for the Department of Agriculture.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Committee will resume its sitting.

AGRICULTURE, RURAL DEVELOPMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1986

The Committee resumed its sitting.

Mrs. SMITH of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROGERS].

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the distinguished ranking member for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of this bill. I want to commend

our distinguished chairman and the ranking member and all the members of this subcommittee. There are a lot of hours, of course, represented in the product that is before us at this time, many hours of hearings, many hours of study and mulling over the problems of agriculture, especially at this time, and the need for us to continue the funding for many of the programs which are the only lifeline really that many of the farmers in our Nation have in many of the programs that are contained in this appropriations bill.

There are a number of things in the bill that are of particular interest to Members of this body individually, but then the bill contains, I think, commendable programs that are essential to us at this particular time. Some of the highlights that I think are significant are on the Agricultural Research Service, the bill reduces funds by \$1.3 million below fiscal year 1985, but increases by about \$9.5 million above the administration request.

The Cooperative State Research Service reduces funding by \$9.8 million below fiscal year 1985 and increases by about \$24.8 million above the request.

The Extension Service, which is so important to our States, it holds nearly even with the fiscal year 1985 level, including some transfers from the Food Stamp Program.

Crop insurance, it denies the administration proposal to eliminate subsidies and administrative support assistance for that program.

□ 1620

There is a slight increase for rural housing, essentially holding the ownership loans and the operating loans even. It keeps the water and sewer grant and loans at the fiscal 1985 level, and retains rural fire protection funding which is important to many of us.

It maintains the approximate same floor for loan levels for telephones and electric co-ops as fiscal 1985 in the REA, and the Soil Conservation Service it holds the programs at the fiscal 1985 level, including the RC&D programs, which I think are terribly important for our countryside.

The Child Nutrition Program has approximately a \$200 million increase of fiscal 1985. It keeps the milk program at the fiscal 1985 level, and there is a slight increase for the WIC Program.

Food stamps increases about \$100 million over fiscal 1985. The temporary Emergency Food Assistance Program for cheese and other products, there is a slight decrease below fiscal 1985.

The Foreign Agricultural Service is at about the 1985 level.

In a State like Kentucky, facing the problems of small farmers, many of them dependent upon tobacco growing as their principal source of cash

income, at a time when that program is facing problems that perhaps are unique in its history, even if the tobacco program is maintained, many of those small farmers are still in need of supplemental, additional income. And in this bill there is a provision in the report language that is of particular importance to those areas.

This bill contains \$150,000 for a comprehensive research program on supplemental fruits and vegetable crops for those types of farmers. The University of Kentucky will be participating with the USDA on research on subjects from cropping to facilities to market research, transportation and the like for such supplemental alternative crops, in addition to the tobacco crop.

In Kentucky, current fruit sales are about \$11 million per year, and vegetable sales about \$16 million. It is estimated that another \$35 million of vegetables could be sold annually, within 10 years, and that within 8 to 10 years that could exceed \$100 million.

This study, 3-year study is particularly significant toward that goal.

For the REA, there is some important report language in the bill relating to the REA. Recently the REA has maintained, I think, a terribly detrimental policy relating to general funds, restricting the availability of loans to electric and telephone borrowers based on the general funds of the co-op. That practice has prevented the REA from allocating the minimum loan levels outlined in appropriation bills. That language specifically in this bill tells the REA to halt that policy. I think that is significant and will be proven to be more so as time passes.

Again I thank the chairman and the ranking member and all of the members of this subcommittee for a lot of hard work. I think we have boiled this down in this bill to the very essence. I think every dollar in there can be justified. There is not more money being spent in this time of tight money than needs to be spent, and I think it adequately funds the programs that need and justify our attention.

So I thank our subcommittee for its hard work, and of course, the full committee, and I rise in strong support of the measure and hope that it passes. I urge my colleagues to support it, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SMITH], a long-time member of the committee.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I support this bill and I commend the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN], the chairman of the subcommittee, and the gentlewoman from Nebraska [Mrs. SMITH] and the others for work on this bill. I think it does as good as we could in these times of tight budgets to not only take care of

the problems of operating farmers with operating programs, but also consumer, nutrition, regulatory agencies, and various research programs which are so important to the future, including a number of research programs at Iowa State University, which I am very interested in. The bill also provides for computerized and other information that we need to make our very important decisions with regard to the 1985 farm bill. I urge support of this bill.

Mrs. SMITH of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. WEBER].

Mr. WEBER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this bill and want to commend the committee for its work on the bill, and particularly the gentleman from Mississippi, Chairman WHITTEN, and the ranking member, the gentlewoman from Nebraska [Mrs. SMITH], for their work on a very important bill at a time that is tremendously difficult in the agricultural sector. I want to add my voice to those of my colleague who was just in the well, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROGERS], in particularly saying that I am pleased that the committee has seen fit to adequately fund the Rural Electrification Program which was in some doubt earlier in this budget cycle because of recommendations from the administration that would have had the effect of in essence gutting the REA Program.

Certainly in my part of the country and in other rural areas across the United States, it is hard to think of any program that has been over the long term more beneficial or more successful than the REA Program, both in bringing electric and telephone service to rural areas. They have done their job well, and there is still work to be done.

I commend the committee for both funding them adequately and dealing in report language with certain problems that have arisen because of the administration of this program over the last few years.

In addition, I would like to point out, Mr. Chairman, that although the bill is a good bill, and probably the best that the committee could do under the circumstances, we face a massive problem in agriculture that cannot be addressed simply by this bill or any other bill. I would like to speak specifically for a second, if I could, just in terms of the Farmers Home Administration.

This bill contains \$700 million in Farmers Home loan money and \$3.4 billion in farm operating loan money. Those are certainly prudent numbers from a strict fiscal standpoint.

But I would just like to share with the Members my view that we face an escalating and, indeed, cascading crisis across rural America, and particularly

in the upper Midwest that is going to render those figures, as generous as the committee has tried to be with them, wholly inadequate by this fall. We have a disastrous situation in the upper Midwest, and indeed throughout much of agricultural America.

Last spring, the whole Nation's attention was directed to this crisis. We faced a massive crisis and it was precipitated particularly in my area of the country by a drastic fall in land values. Federal and State examiners went through the banks in the Midwest and across the country and devalued land, at least in my district, by 50 percent across-the-board for most of the banks in my congressional district. They have since gone back to my congressional district, and far from revaluing that land upward, they have chosen to revalue it downward somewhat.

In addition to that immediate precipitating problem, we have faced long-term problems in agriculture of low prices and high interest rates. The Nation focused its attention on this agricultural problem last spring, and the country was suddenly sympathetic to the plight of the farmers and the farm problem was on the cover of Time, as well as we saw movies dedicated to that problem. But the massive bankruptcies that some predicted at that time did not quite materialize, at least in the number that we had anticipated they might. So many people conclude that the problem was not as severe as it was described to us last spring.

Mr. Chairman, that simply is not the case, and I am alerting the body here today, as I have done in the past, that all we did last spring really was delay the problem somewhat, and it is going to face us in spades, in my judgment, I am sorry to say, this fall.

Last spring the lending institutions across rural America decided that they were going to stick with their farm borrowers, as much as they could, and they were as generous in their lending practices as they could be. In essence, they gambled on higher prices and lower interest rates, and tried to keep their marginal borrowers in business as much as they could.

Unfortunately, those favorable conditions did not materialize, and unless something changes drastically, we are not going to see higher farm prices in the fall; we are going to see lower farm prices. And interest rates that will change very little, if at all, in the agricultural sector.

That means that those lenders that tried to be generous with their marginal borrowers in the spring are going to be in very difficult shape when it comes time to receive repayment this fall. And I believe we will see a massive problem, a massive credit problem, develop in rural America, particularly in the upper Midwest, when those lenders seek repayment this fall.

□ 1630

At that time, substantial additional pressure is going to be put on the Farmers Home Administration to accommodate borrowers that are going to be literally shoved out of private lending institutions. Again, I commend the committee for the good job it has done.

Mr. Chairman, I intend to support the bill but I want to alert the committee as well as the Congress to this Member's opinion that the problem in agriculture in America is growing and we are going to have to come back again and again to deal with that very severe problem.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Hawaii [Mr. AKAKA], a member of the committee.

Mr. AKAKA. I thank the Chairman. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the bill. I want to praise my chairman, Mr. WHITTEN of Mississippi, and our ranking minority person, Mrs. SMITH of Nebraska, the members of the committee and the staff for doing such a wonderful job in helping the farmers of our country.

As we look at agriculture in our country, in the world today there is no question in our minds that agriculture is one of the most important industries for human survival in the world. When we think of agriculture starting in backyards of farmers, growing into huge conglomerate farming and producing units, producing farm commodities for our country and also for other parts of the world, this has grown to be the largest industry in our country. It has become the backbone industry of our country. As such, it is one of the industries that our country must look to in continuing operations and continuing with the farmers so that they can continue to produce.

As we look at the problems that our farming community is facing, they are in a crisis at the present time. Many of them are suffering from financial crisis, which will mean that many of them will be going out of business.

I attended some hearings held in some of our southern States and we heard the farmers literally cry on our shoulders and beg for help that would keep them in the farming business.

Unfortunately, we were not able to help them with our farm emergency bill which was vetoed by the administration.

But we hope we can continue to help them with some of the programs that this committee has taken on, and that we will continue to help them.

One of the programs they wanted to be continued was the Soil Conservation Service. I am glad that this committee has been able to continue that service for our farmers throughout the country.

I look upon our responsibility in this committee as being very, very important for the farmers of our country.

I want to commend the members of the committee again, especially our chairman, Mr. WHITTEN, and Mrs. SMITH of Nebraska for their help and guidance on this committee.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support the bill.

Mrs. SMITH of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, we have no further requests for time, and we reserve the balance of our time.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, we have two more speakers on this side who have requested time.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN], a member of the subcommittee.

Mr. DURBIN. I thank the Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, as a Member of the House of Representatives, I represent a congressional district which was represented more than 140 years ago by a gentleman by the name of Abraham Lincoln. When he was elected President of the United States, of course, he made history not only in our Nation, but in the world. There are several facets of the Lincoln administration which are not well-known. One of them is the fact that President Abraham Lincoln created a fledgling Department known as the Department of Agriculture.

For the very first time in America, we decided as a Nation that it was a Federal responsibility for us to be concerned about feeding our Nation and in fact feeding the people of the world in many years to come.

There are many great resources of American agriculture which have come from this effort and from our people and from our Nation; our rich soil, our technological strength, our productivity, our research, and those other intangibles, the industry and intelligence of American farmers, the family values that they bring to this great country.

But I have discovered in my short time on this subcommittee and on the full Committee on Appropriations, there is another great agricultural resource in America. I refer to our chairman, Mr. WHITTEN. He has humbled so many witnesses with his encyclopedic knowledge of agricultural programs. He has stunned many witnesses in our subcommittee when they came to learn that what they thought was a new idea had been tried before. Chairman WHITTEN then reported on the results of that previous effort. He has brought more than a historical perspective to this subcommittee's effort in this bill.

He has brought the vision to the future. I particularly refer to that section of the bill where we, in the sub-

committee, paid close attention to the needs for continuing research and continuing efforts to develop technology so that American agriculture will continue to lead the world.

One of the elements is a source of great pride to those of us in Illinois. It is a proposal for a plant and animal sciences research center at the University of Illinois. This biotechnical research center answers the No. 1 agricultural research priority of the U.S. Department of Agriculture and it does it in a fashion that is fiscally responsible. It suggests that the Federal Government will be involved in the building of this center but with the commitment from the University of Illinois to pay to equip it and to pay those operating expenses necessary.

This partnership, this sharing of expense, I think tackles the reality we face today of a budget deficit.

I am happy to support this particular effort of the Agriculture Subcommittee; I am proud to be a part of this effort. Mr. Chairman, I commend it to my colleagues.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to a member of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. WATKINS].

Mr. WATKINS. I thank the Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, first I would like to stand and express my support for this particular Agricultural and Rural Development Appropriation Subcommittee bill. Second, I want to thank our chairman of the subcommittee, Mr. WHITTEN from Mississippi, and also the ranking minority member, Mrs. SMITH of Nebraska, and all the subcommittee members on both sides of the aisle for their deep and sincere and genuine concern and interest in the plight of the American farmer and the plight that exists in rural America.

I want to thank the staff for their time and extra effort which they are putting in because of the crisis that we face in agriculture today.

I only want to make one statement because I think this bill addresses as well as it can today the survivability of rural America under the trying circumstances that we have. But I think as a Congress, I think as a nation, as a legislative body we are going to have to ask the question and to answer the question: Is the basic agricultural industry important for the national security and survivability of our Nation? I think the answer to that is definitely yes. I think in the months and years ahead we are going to have to decide what we are going to do and what priority we are going to have to place on meeting the needs of this Nation.

So, Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the chairman again and the other members of the committee and the staff for the job that they have done to try to shape and to fashion a bill which under the trying circumstances

we have today, I think does a good job, allows us to move forward and hopefully will help agriculture and rural America survive.

● Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Chairman's amendment providing additional moneys for FDA to continue its research activities into the transmission, prevention, and control of HTLV-III infection and AIDS. Our committee has consistently provided the funds necessary to AIDS research by the NIH, CDC, and the FDA and has closely followed their progress in the search for a prevention, treatment, and cure of this tragic illness.

We have come a long way since this tragic illness first came to national attention, but there is still much work to be done. Some of the areas identified by our Secretary of Health and Human Services as needing greater attention are:

A 5-year followup and evaluation of blood donors who are found positive by the HTLV-III screening to determine the medical significance of the test results;

A study of the impact of additional tests for HTLV-III and other retroviruses on the safety of the blood supply;

A study to clarify the means of transmission of HTLV-III among homosexual males and AIDS patients;

Additional monitoring of the HTLV-III test kits for quality control;

The review and approval of second and third generation tests for AIDS and evaluation of diagnostic and treatment products, including an eventual vaccine against the HTLV-III virus.

I am pleased with the tremendous successes we have had in combating AIDS. We have identified HTLV-III as the causative agent, we have developed a screening test for the HTLV-III virus, and have begun to educate the public about AIDS. But our job is far from over. We need to know more about the viral components of the disease, that we can move quickly in developing a vaccine. We need to develop an efficient, accurate test to screen blood donations in order to protect the Nation's blood supply. We need epidemiological studies to understand how AIDS is spreading through the population. The FDA's role in this process is vital. We now need to focus on the activities outlined above. The moneys provided for in this amendment are essential to the continued progress of the NIH, CDC, and FDA in their battle against AIDS. ●

● Mrs. LLOYD. Mr. Chairman, it is becoming increasingly evident that the cost of farm programs has become the major sticking point in efforts on both sides of the Capitol to write Federal farm policy for the coming years. The triple objective of lowering market prices, maintaining farmers' incomes and reducing the program's cost has so

far eluded the best designs of congressional policy makers. This bill holds the line at last years spending level while reauthorizing programs which are absolutely essential to the Department of Agriculture to maintain and which are vital, not only to the present economic well being of our farmers, but to the future of American agriculture.

Mr. Chairman agriculture is the Nation's main generator of new wealth. It is estimated that each dollar taken from the soil multiplies seven times as it travels through the Nation's financial system. It is our country's largest industry, yet not a day goes by when the press does not report on the seriousness of the conditions facing American agriculture. Bankruptcies are prevalent, and loss of farms that have been in a family for generations is commonplace. This situation demands immediate action by Congress because time is running out for many desperate farmers. Failure to act will only result in the devastating loss of more farms, not only in the Third Congressional District of Tennessee but across the Nation. For the benefit of all—farmer, consumer, industry, and labor—the importance of American agriculture to our society and our economy must be recognized and perpetuated. The American farmer must have equal opportunity under the law to maintain parity with all other segments of this Nation's economy. The future strength and prosperity of this country depends on this. ●

● Mr. BRUCE. Mr. Chairman, American agriculture faces a great challenge. Competition from foreign agricultural producers in threatening the vitality of our Nation's farm industry. Benefits will be realized by the Nation whose agricultural system incorporates new knowledge with the greatest speed. With this in mind, I rise in support of H.R. 3037, and more specifically, the proposed Plant and Animal Science Research Center at the University of Illinois in Champaign-Urbana.

In the past 40 years, production costs for U.S. agriculture have risen markedly. History has proven that in any industry, a constant flow of new technology that increases efficiency and quality is necessary to reduce production costs and maintain markets. That essential flow of new technology traditionally comes from sound basic research in combination with vigorous programs of applied research, and implemented through the cooperative efforts of Federal and State institutions.

Last year, the Appropriations Subcommittee on Agriculture, Rural Development, and Related Agencies, requested the U.S. Department of Agriculture to do a feasibility study on establishing a Plant and Animal Sciences Research Center at the University of Illinois. The study concluded

that the best interests of American consumers and American agriculture can be served by establishing this center in Champaign-Urbana.

The University of Illinois in Champaign-Urbana is uniquely qualified to operate such a research center. It is centrally located, and lies in the heart of the major corn and soybean production area of the Nation. It currently has 125 scientists engaged directly in biotechnology research, a field widely recognized as essential for the prosperous future of U.S. agriculture. It also has one of the most productive contingents of USDA plant scientists, along with a host of research facilities, including 2,200 acres of fields, herds and flocks located immediately adjacent to the campus. Representative KIKI DE LA GARZA, chairman of the Agriculture Committee, personally endorsed the project after visiting the campus last October.

An historic opportunity for improving the efficiency of agricultural production awaits. Major achievements in genetics, biochemistry, physiology, and molecular biology have advanced our scientists to the threshold of a new era in agricultural productivity. U.S. agricultural scientists will either lead or be led. It is in the best interests of our nation to invest wisely in one of our most envied assets—agricultural productivity. A Plant and Animal Sciences Research Center at the University of Illinois could help ensure the superior agricultural efficiency that is essential for this Nation's economic health and security. ●

Mrs. SMITH of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired.

The Clerk will read.

□ 1640

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 3037

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for Agriculture, Rural Development, and Related Agencies programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1986, and for other purposes; namely:

TITLE I—AGRICULTURAL PROGRAMS

PRODUCTION, PROCESSING AND MARKETING

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

For necessary expenses of the Office of the Secretary of Agriculture, including not to exceed \$75,000 for employment under 5 U.S.C. 3109, \$1,750,000: *Provided*, That not to exceed \$8,000 of this amount shall be available for official reception and representation expenses, not otherwise provided for, as determined by the Secretary.

OFFICE OF THE ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR ADMINISTRATION

For necessary expenses of the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Administration to carry out the programs funded in this Act, \$484,000.

STANDARD LEVEL USER CHARGES (USDA)

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

For payment of Standard Level User Charges pursuant to Public Law 92-313 for programs and activities of the Department of Agriculture which are included in this Act, \$49,454,000: *Provided*, That in the event an agency within the Department of Agriculture should require modification of space needs, the Secretary of Agriculture may transfer a share of that agency's appropriation made available by this Act to this appropriation, or may transfer a share of this appropriation to that agency's appropriation, but such transfers shall not exceed 10 per centum of the funds made available for Standard Level User Charges to or from this account.

BUILDING OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE

For the operation, maintenance, and repair of the Washington, D.C. Agriculture building complex pursuant to the delegation of authority from the Administrator of General Services authorized by 40 U.S.C. 486, \$17,800,000.

ADVISORY COMMITTEES (USDA)

For necessary expenses for activities of Advisory Committees of the Department of Agriculture which are included in this Act, \$1,323,000: *Provided*, That no other funds in this Act shall be available to the Department of Agriculture for support of activities of Advisory Committees.

DEPARTMENTAL ADMINISTRATION

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

For Budget and Program Analysis, \$3,796,000; for Personnel, Finance and Management, Operations, Information Resources Management, Equal Opportunity, Small and Disadvantaged Business Utilization, and Administrative Law Judges and Judicial Officer, \$15,334,000; making a total of \$19,130,000 for Departmental Administration to provide for necessary expenses for management support services to offices of the Department of Agriculture and for general administration of the Department of Agriculture, repairs and alterations, and other miscellaneous supplies and expenses not otherwise provided for and necessary for the practical and efficient work of the Department of Agriculture, of which not to exceed \$10,000 is for employment under 5 U.S.C. 3109: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall be reimbursed from applicable appropriations in this Act for travel expenses incident to the holding of hearings as required by 5 U.S.C. 551-558.

WORKING CAPITAL FUND

An amount of \$6,000,000 is hereby appropriated to the Departmental Working Capital Fund to increase the Government's equity in this fund and to provide for the purchase of automated data processing, data communication, and other related equipment necessary for the provision of Departmental centralized services to the agencies.

OFFICE OF THE ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR GOVERNMENTAL AND PUBLIC AFFAIRS

For necessary expenses of the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Governmental and Public Affairs to carry out the programs funded in this Act, \$337,000.

PUBLIC AFFAIRS

For necessary expenses to carry on services relating to the coordination of programs involving public affairs, and for the dissemination of agricultural information and the coordination of information, work and programs authorized by Congress in the Department, \$6,758,000, of which not to exceed \$10,000 shall be available for employment under 5 U.S.C. 3109, and not to exceed \$2,000,000 may be used for farmers' bulletins and not fewer than two hundred thirty-two thousand two hundred and fifty copies for the use of the Senate and House of Representatives of part 2 of the annual report of the Secretary (known as the Yearbook of Agriculture) as authorized by 44 U.S.C. 1301: *Provided*, That in the preparation of motion pictures or exhibits by the Department, this appropriation shall be available for employment pursuant to the second sentence of section 706(a) of the Organic Act of 1944 (7 U.S.C. 2225).

LEGISLATIVE LIAISON

For necessary expenses for liaison with the Congress on legislative matters, \$495,000.

INTERGOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS

For necessary expenses for programs involving intergovernmental affairs, emergency preparedness, and liaison within the executive branch, \$467,000.

OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

For necessary expenses of the Office of the Inspector General, including employment pursuant to the second sentence of section 706(a) of the Organic Act of 1944 (7 U.S.C. 2225), \$30,756,000, including such sums as may be necessary for contracting and other arrangements with public agencies and private persons pursuant to section 6(a)(8) of the Inspector General Act of 1978 (Public Law 95-452), and including a sum not to exceed \$50,000 for employment under 5 U.S.C. 3109; and including a sum not to exceed \$75,000 for certain confidential operational expenses including the payment of informants, to be expended under the direction of the Inspector General pursuant to Public Law 95-452 and section 1337 of Public Law 97-98; and in addition, \$15,924,000 shall be derived by transfer from the appropriation, "Food Stamp Program", and merged with this appropriation.

OFFICE OF THE GENERAL COUNSEL

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

For necessary expenses, \$15,077,000; and in addition, \$786,000 shall be derived by transfer from the appropriation, "Food Stamp Program", and merged with this appropriation.

OFFICE OF THE ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR ECONOMICS

For necessary expenses of the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Economics to carry out the programs funded in this Act, \$418,000.

ECONOMIC RESEARCH SERVICE

For necessary expenses of the Economic Research Service in conducting economic research and service relating to agricultural production, marketing, and distribution, as authorized by the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946 (7 U.S.C. 1621-1627), and other laws, including economics of marketing; analyses relating to farm prices, income and population, and demand for farm products, use of resources in agriculture, adjustments, costs and returns in farming, and farm fi-

nance; research relating to the economic and marketing aspects of farmer cooperatives; and for analyses of supply and demand for farm products in foreign countries and their effect on prospects for United States exports, progress in economic development and its relation to sales of farm products, assembly and analysis of agricultural trade statistics and analysis of international financial and monetary programs and policies as they affect the competitive position of United States farm products; \$46,305,000; of which not less than \$200,000 shall be available for investigation, determination and finding as to the effect upon the production of food and upon the agricultural economy of any proposed action affecting such subject matter pending before the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency for presentation, in the public interest, before said Administrator, other agencies or before the courts: *Provided*, That not less than \$350,000 of the funds contained in this appropriation shall be available to continue to gather statistics and conduct a special study on the price spread between the farmer and consumer: *Provided further*, That this appropriation shall be available for employment pursuant to the second sentence of section 706(a) of the Organic Act of 1944 (7 U.S.C. 2225): *Provided further*, That not less than \$145,000 of the funds contained in this appropriation shall be available for analysis of statistics and related facts on foreign production and full and complete information on methods used by other countries to move farm commodities in world trade on a competitive basis.

STATISTICAL REPORTING SERVICE

For necessary expenses of the Statistical Reporting Service in conducting statistical reporting and service work, including crop and livestock estimates, statistical coordination and improvements, and marketing surveys, as authorized by the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946 (7 U.S.C. 1621-1627) and other laws, \$59,079,000: *Provided*, That no part of the funds herein appropriated shall be available for any expense incident to publishing estimates of apple production for other than the commercial crop: *Provided further*, That this appropriation shall be available for employment pursuant to the second sentence of section 706(a) of the Organic Act of 1944 (7 U.S.C. 2225), and not to exceed \$40,000 shall be available for employment under 5 U.S.C. 3109.

WORLD AGRICULTURAL OUTLOOK BOARD

For necessary expenses of the World Agricultural Outlook Board to coordinate and review all commodity and aggregate agricultural and food data used to develop outlook and situation material within the Department of Agriculture, as authorized by the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946 (7 U.S.C. 1622g), \$1,680,000: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall be available for employment pursuant to the second sentence of section 706(a) of the Organic Act of 1944 (7 U.S.C. 2225).

OFFICE OF THE ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR SCIENCE AND EDUCATION

For necessary salaries and expenses for the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Science and Education to administer the laws enacted by the Congress for the Agricultural Research Service, Cooperative State Research Service, Extension Service, and National Agricultural Library, \$371,000.

AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH SERVICE (INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

For necessary expenses to enable the Agricultural Research Service to perform agricultural research and demonstration relating to production, utilization, marketing, and distribution (not otherwise provided for), home economics or nutrition and consumer use, and to coordinate and provide program leadership for higher education work of the Department, and for acquisition of lands by donation, exchange, or purchase at a nominal cost not to exceed \$100; \$492,806,000: *Provided*, That appropriations hereunder shall be available for field employment pursuant to the second sentence of section 706(a) of the Organic Act of 1944 (7 U.S.C. 2225), and not to exceed \$115,000 shall be available for employment under 5 U.S.C. 3109: *Provided further*, That funds appropriated herein can be used to provide financial assistance to the organizers of national and international conferences, if such conferences are in support of agency programs: *Provided further*, That appropriations hereunder shall be available for the operation and maintenance of aircraft and the purchase of not to exceed one for replacement only: *Provided further*, That uniform allowances for each uniformed employee of the Agricultural Research Service shall not be in excess of \$400 annually: *Provided further*, That of the appropriations hereunder not less than \$10,526,600 shall be available to conduct marketing research: *Provided further*, That appropriations hereunder shall be available pursuant to 7 U.S.C. 2250 for the construction, alteration, and repair of buildings and improvements, but unless otherwise provided the cost of constructing any one building shall not exceed \$150,000, except for greenhouses connecting greenhouses which shall each be limited to \$500,000, and except for ten buildings to be constructed or improved at a cost not to exceed \$275,000 each, and the cost of altering any one building during the fiscal year shall not exceed 10 per centum of the current replacement value of the building or \$150,000 whichever is greater: *Provided further*, That the limitations on alterations contained in this Act shall not apply to a total of \$250,000 for facilities at Beltsville, Maryland: *Provided further*, That the foregoing limitations shall not apply to replacement of buildings needed to carry out the Act of April 24, 1948 (21 U.S.C. 113a): *Provided further*, That the limitation on purchase of land shall not apply to the purchase of land at Fresno, California, or to an option to purchase land at Florence, South Carolina, for a term of not to exceed one year: *Provided further*, That the limitations on construction contained in this Act shall not apply to the establishment of the National Clonal Germplasm Repository for Citrus, Riverside, California: *Provided further*, That not to exceed \$200,000 of this appropriation may be transferred to and merged with the appropriation for the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Science and Education for the scientific review of international issues involving agricultural chemicals and food additives.

Special fund: To provide for additional labor, subprofessional, and junior scientific help to be employed under contracts and cooperative agreements to strengthen the work at Federal research installations in the field, \$200,000.

BUILDINGS AND FACILITIES

For acquisition of land, construction, repair, improvement, extension, alteration,

and purchase of fixed equipment or facilities of or used by the Agricultural Research Service, where not otherwise provided, \$3,600,000.

COOPERATIVE STATE RESEARCH SERVICE

For payments to agricultural experiment stations, for cooperative forestry and other research, for facilities, and for other expenses, including \$156,484,000 to carry into effect the provisions of the Hatch Act approved March 2, 1887, as amended by the Act approved August 11, 1955 (7 U.S.C. 361a-361i), and further amended by Public Law 92-318 approved June 23, 1972, and further amended by Public Law 93-471 approved October 26, 1974, including administration by the United States Department of Agriculture, and penalty mail costs of agricultural experiment stations under section 6 of the Hatch Act of 1887, as amended, and payments under section 1361(c) of the Act of October 3, 1980 (7 U.S.C. 301n.); \$13,053,000 for grants for cooperative forestry research under the Act approved October 10, 1962 (16 U.S.C. 582a-582a-7), as amended by Public Law 92-318 approved June 23, 1972, including administrative expenses, and payments under section 1361(c) of the Act of October 3, 1980 (7 U.S.C. 301n.); \$23,474,000 for payments to the 1890 land-grant colleges, including Tuskegee Institute, for research under section 1445 of the National Agricultural Research, Extension, and Teaching Policy Act of 1977 (Public Law 95-113), as amended, including administration by the United States Department of Agriculture, and penalty mail costs of the 1890 land-grant colleges, including Tuskegee Institute; \$27,310,000 for contracts and grants for agricultural research under the Act of August 4, 1965, as amended (7 U.S.C. 450i); \$34,000,000 for competitive research grants, including administrative expenses; \$5,760,000 for the support of animal health and disease programs authorized by section 1433 of Public Law 95-113, including administrative expenses; \$1,202,000 for research authorized by the Critical Agricultural Materials Act of 1984; \$500,000 for rangeland research grants as authorized by subtitle M of the National Agricultural Research, Extension, and Teaching Policy Act of 1977, as amended; \$10,000,000 for grants to upgrade 1890 land-grant college research facilities as authorized by section 1433 of Public Law 97-98, to remain available until expended; \$3,000,000 for higher education strengthening grants under section 1417(a)(2)(A) of Public Law 95-113, as amended (7 U.S.C. 3152(a)(2)(A)); and \$1,645,000 for necessary expenses of Cooperative State Research Service activities, including administration of payments to State agricultural experiment stations, funds for employment pursuant to the second sentence of section 706(a) of the Organic Act of 1944 (7 U.S.C. 2225), and not to exceed \$50,000 for employment under 5 U.S.C. 3109; in all, \$276,428,000.

EXTENSION SERVICE

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

Payments to States, Puerto Rico, Guam, the Virgin Islands, Micronesia, and American Samoa: For payments for cooperative agricultural extension work under the Smith-Lever Act, as amended by the Act of June 26, 1953, the Act of August 11, 1955, the Act of October 5, 1962 (7 U.S.C. 341-349), section 506 of the Act of June 23, 1972, and the Act of September 29, 1977 (7 U.S.C. 341-349), as amended, and section 1361(c) of the Act of October 3, 1980 (7 U.S.C. 301n.), to be distributed under sections 3(b) and

3(c) of the Act, for retirement and employees' compensation costs for extension agents, and for costs of penalty mail for cooperative extension agents and State extension directors, \$241,484,000; payments for the nutrition and family education program for low-income areas under section 3(d) of the Act, \$60,354,000, of which \$38,627,000 shall be derived by transfer from the appropriation, "Food Stamp Program", and merged with this appropriation; payments for the urban gardening program under section 3(d) of the Act, \$3,500,000; payments for the pest management program under section 3(d) of the Act, \$7,531,000; payments for the farm safety program under section 3(d) of the Act, \$1,020,000; payments for the integrated reproductive management program under section 3(d) of the Act, \$50,000; payments for the pesticide impact assessment program under section 3(d) of the Act, \$1,716,000; payments for a financial management assistance program under section 3(d) of the Act, \$1,000,000; payments for extension work under section 209(c) of Public Law 93-471, \$983,000; payments for extension work by the colleges receiving the benefits of the second Morrill Act (7 U.S.C. 321-326, 328) and Tuskegee Institute, \$17,741,000; in all, \$296,752,000; of which not less than \$79,400,000 is for Home Economics: *Provided*, That funds hereby appropriated pursuant to section 3(c) of the Act of June 26, 1953, and section 506 of the Act of June 23, 1972, as amended, shall not be paid to any State, Puerto Rico, Guam, or the Virgin Islands, Micronesia, and American Samoa prior to availability of an equal sum from non-Federal sources for expenditure during the current fiscal year.

Federal administration and coordination: For administration of the Smith-Lever Act, as amended by the Act of June 26, 1953, the Act of August 11, 1955, the Act of October 5, 1962, section 506 of the Act of June 23, 1972, section 209(d) of Public Law 93-471, and the Act of September 29, 1977 (7 U.S.C. 341-349), as amended, and section 1361(c) of the Act of October 3, 1980 (7 U.S.C. 301n.), and to coordinate and provide program leadership for the extension work of the Department and the several States and insular possessions, \$5,979,000; of which not less than \$2,300,000 is for Home Economics.

NATIONAL AGRICULTURAL LIBRARY

For necessary expenses of the National Agricultural Library, \$11,340,000: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall be available for employment pursuant to the second sentence of section 706(a) of the Organic Act of 1944 (7 U.S.C. 2225), and not to exceed \$35,000 shall be available for employment under 5 U.S.C. 3109: *Provided further*, That not to exceed \$575,000 shall be available pursuant to 7 U.S.C. 2250 for the alteration and repair of buildings and improvements.

OFFICE OF THE ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR MARKETING AND INSPECTION SERVICES

For necessary salaries and expenses for the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Marketing and Inspection Services to administer programs under the laws enacted by the Congress for the Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Food Safety and Inspection Service, Federal Grain Inspection Service, Agricultural Cooperative Service, Agricultural Marketing Service, (including Office of Transportation) and Packers and Stockyards Administration, \$347,000.

ANIMAL AND PLANT HEALTH INSPECTION SERVICE SALARIES AND EXPENSES (INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

For expenses, not otherwise provided for, including those pursuant to the Act of February 28, 1947, as amended (21 U.S.C. 114b-c), necessary to prevent, control, and eradicate pests and plant and animal diseases; to carry out inspection, quarantine, and regulatory activities; and to protect the environment, as authorized by law, \$281,165,000; of which \$3,000,000 shall be available for the control of outbreaks of insects, plant diseases and animal diseases to the extent necessary to meet emergency conditions: *Provided*, That \$1,000,000 of the funds for control of the fire ant shall be placed in reserve for matching purposes with States which may come into the program: *Provided further*, That no funds shall be used to formulate or administer a brucellosis eradication program for the current fiscal year that does not require minimum matching by the States of at least 40 per centum: *Provided further*, That this appropriation shall be available for field employment pursuant to the second sentence of section 706(a) of the Organic Act of 1944 (7 U.S.C. 2225), and not to exceed \$40,000 shall be available for employment under 5 U.S.C. 3109: *Provided further*, That this appropriation shall be available for the operation and maintenance of aircraft and the purchase of not to exceed two, of which one shall be for replacement only: *Provided further*, That, in addition, in emergencies which threaten any segment of the agricultural production industry of this country, the Secretary may transfer from other appropriations or funds available to the agencies or corporations of the Department such sums as he may deem necessary, to be available only in such emergencies for the arrest and eradication of contagious or infectious diseases or pests of animals, poultry, or plants, and for expenses in accordance with the Act of February 28, 1947, as amended, and section 102 of the Act of September 21, 1944, as amended, and any unexpended balances of funds transferred for such emergency purposes in the next preceding fiscal year shall be merged with such transferred amounts.

BUILDINGS AND FACILITIES

For plans, construction, repair, improvement, extension, alteration, and purchase of fixed equipment or facilities, as authorized by 7 U.S.C. 2250, and acquisition of land as authorized by 7 U.S.C. 428a, \$4,262,000.

FOOD SAFETY AND INSPECTION SERVICE

For necessary expenses to carry on services authorized by the Federal Meat Inspection Act, as amended, and the Poultry Products Inspection Act, as amended, \$358,494,000: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall be available for field employment pursuant to section 706(a) of the Organic Act of 1944 (7 U.S.C. 2225), and not to exceed \$75,000 shall be available for employment under 5 U.S.C. 3109: *Provided further*, That this appropriation shall be available pursuant to law (7 U.S.C. 2250) for the alteration and repair of buildings and improvements, but the cost of altering any one building during the fiscal year shall not exceed 10 per centum of the current replacement value of the building.

FEDERAL GRAIN INSPECTION SERVICE SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses to carry out the provisions of the United States Grain Standards Act, as amended, and the stand-

ardization activities related to grain under the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946, as amended, including field employment pursuant to section 706(a) of the Organic Act of 1944 (7 U.S.C. 2225), and not to exceed \$20,000 for employment under 5 U.S.C. 3109, \$7,045,000: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall be available pursuant to law (7 U.S.C. 2250) for the alteration and repair of buildings and improvements, but, unless otherwise provided, the cost of altering any one building during the fiscal year shall not exceed 10 per centum of the current replacement value of the building: *Provided further*, That none of the funds provided by this Act may be used to pay the salaries of any person or persons who require, or who authorize payments from fee-supported funds to persons or persons who require, nonexport, nonterminal interior elevators to maintain records not involving official inspection or official weighing in the United States under Public Law 94-582 other than those necessary to fulfill the purposes of such Act.

INSPECTION AND WEIGHING SERVICES

LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

Not to exceed \$36,856,000 (from fees collected) shall be obligated during the current fiscal year for Inspection and Weighing Services.

AGRICULTURAL COOPERATIVE SERVICE

For necessary expenses to carry out the Cooperative Marketing Act of July 2, 1926 (7 U.S.C. 451-457), and for activities relating to the marketing aspects of cooperatives, including economic research and analysis and the application of economic research findings, as authorized by the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946 (7 U.S.C. 1621-1627), and for activities with institutions or organizations throughout the world concerning the development and operation of agricultural cooperatives (7 U.S.C. 3291), \$4,713,000; of which \$139,000 shall be available for a field office in Hawaii: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall be available for employment pursuant to the second sentence of section 706(a) of the Organic Act of 1944 (7 U.S.C. 2225), and not to exceed \$15,000 shall be available for employment under 5 U.S.C. 3109.

AGRICULTURAL MARKETING SERVICE

MARKETING SERVICES

For necessary expenses to carry on services related to consumer protection, agricultural marketing and distribution and regulatory programs as authorized by law, and for administration and coordination of payments to States; including field employment pursuant to section 706(a) of the Organic Act of 1944 (7 U.S.C. 2225), and not to exceed \$70,000 for employment under 5 U.S.C. 3109, \$31,455,000; of which not less than \$1,582,000 shall be available for the Wholesale Market Development Program for the design and development of wholesale and farmer market facilities for the major metropolitan areas of the country: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall be available pursuant to law (7 U.S.C. 2250) for the alteration and repair of buildings and improvements, but, unless otherwise provided, the cost of altering any one building during the fiscal year shall not exceed 10 per centum of the current replacement value of the building.

LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

Not to exceed \$27,253,000 (from fees collected) shall be obligated during the current fiscal year for administrative expenses.

**FUNDS FOR STRENGTHENING MARKETS, INCOME,
AND SUPPLY (SECTION 32)**

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

Funds available under section 32 of the Act of August 24, 1935 (7 U.S.C. 612c) shall be used only for commodity program expenses as authorized therein, and other related operating expenses, except for: (1) transfers to the Department of Commerce as authorized by the Fish and Wildlife Act of August 8, 1956; (2) transfers otherwise provided in this Act; and (3) not more than \$6,193,000 for formulation and administration of Marketing Agreements and Orders pursuant to the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended, and the Agricultural Act of 1961.

PAYMENTS TO STATES AND POSSESSIONS

For payments to departments of agriculture, bureaus and departments of markets, and similar agencies for marketing activities under section 204(b) of the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946 (7 U.S.C. 1623(b)), \$990,000.

OFFICE OF TRANSPORTATION

For necessary expenses to carry on services related to agricultural transportation programs as authorized by law; including field employment pursuant to section 706(a) of the Organic Act of 1944 (7 U.S.C. 2225), and not to exceed \$20,000 for employment under 5 U.S.C. 3109, \$2,466,000: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall be available pursuant to law (7 U.S.C. 2250) for the alteration and repair of buildings and improvements, but, unless otherwise provided, the cost of altering any one building during the fiscal year shall not exceed 10 per centum of the current replacement value of the building.

PACKERS AND STOCKYARDS ADMINISTRATION

For necessary expenses for administration of the Packers and Stockyards Act, as authorized by law, including field employment pursuant to section 706(a) of the Organic Act of 1944 (7 U.S.C. 2225), and not to exceed \$5,000 for employment under 5 U.S.C. 3109, \$9,201,000.

FARM INCOME STABILIZATION

OFFICE OF THE UNDER SECRETARY FOR INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS AND COMMODITY PROGRAMS

For necessary salaries and expenses for the Office of the Under Secretary for International Affairs and Commodity Programs to administer the laws enacted by Congress for the Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service, Office of International Cooperation and Development, Foreign Agricultural Service, and the Commodity Credit Corporation, \$502,000.

**AGRICULTURAL STABILIZATION AND
CONSERVATION SERVICE
SALARIES AND EXPENSES**

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

For necessary administrative expenses of the Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service, including expenses to formulate and carry out programs authorized by title III of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended (7 U.S.C. 1301-1393); the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended (7 U.S.C. 1421 et seq.); sections 7 to 15, 16(a), 16(f), and 17 of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended and supplemented (16 U.S.C. 590g-590o, 590p(a), 590p(f), and 590q); sections 1001 to 1004, 1006 to 1008, and 1010 of the Agricultural Act of 1970 as added by the Agriculture and Consumer Protection Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1501 to 1504, 1506 to 1508, and 1510); the

Water Bank Act, as amended (16 U.S.C. 1301-1311); the Cooperative Forestry Assistance Act of 1978 (16 U.S.C. 2101); sections 401, 402, and 404 to 406 of the Agricultural Credit Act of 1978 (16 U.S.C. 2201 to 2205); and laws pertaining to the Commodity Credit Corporation, \$395,119,000: *Provided*, That not to exceed \$395,119,000 may be transferred to this account from the Commodity Credit Corporation fund: *Provided further*, That other funds made available to the Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service for authorized activities may be advanced to and merged with this account: *Provided further*, That these funds shall be available for employment pursuant to the second sentence of section 706(a) of the Organic Act of 1944 (7 U.S.C. 2225), and not to exceed \$100,000 shall be available for employment under 5 U.S.C. 3109: *Provided further*, That no part of the funds appropriated or made available under this Act shall be used (1) to influence the vote in any referendum; (2) to influence agricultural legislation, except as permitted in 18 U.S.C. 1913; or (3) for salaries or other expenses of members of county and community committees established pursuant to section 8(b) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended, for engaging in any activities other than advisory and supervisory duties and delegated program functions prescribed in administrative regulations.

DAIRY INDEMNITY PROGRAM

For necessary expenses involved in making indemnity payments to dairy farmers for milk or cows producing such milk and manufacturers of dairy products who have been directed to remove their milk or dairy products from commercial markets because it contained residues of chemicals registered and approved for use by the Federal Government, and in making indemnity payments for milk, or cows producing such milk, at a fair market value to any dairy farmer who is directed to remove his milk from commercial markets because of (1) the presence of products of nuclear radiation or fallout if such contamination is not due to the fault of the farmer, or (2) residues of chemicals or toxic substances not included under the first sentence of the Act of August 13, 1968, as amended (7 U.S.C. 450j), if such chemicals or toxic substances were not used in a manner contrary to applicable regulations or labeling instructions provided at the time of use and the contamination is not due to the fault of the farmer, \$100,000: *Provided*, That none of the funds contained in this Act shall be used to make indemnity payments to any farmer whose milk was removed from commercial markets as a result of his willful failure to follow procedures prescribed by the Federal Government.

CORPORATIONS

The following corporations and agencies are hereby authorized to make such expenditures, within the limits of funds and borrowing authority available to each such corporation or agency and in accord with law, and to make such contracts and commitments without regard to fiscal year limitations as provided by section 104 of the Government Corporation Control Act, as amended, as may be necessary in carrying out the programs set forth in the budget for the current fiscal year for such corporation or agency, except as hereinafter provided:

FEDERAL CROP INSURANCE CORPORATION

ADMINISTRATIVE AND OPERATING EXPENSES

For administrative and operating expenses, as authorized by the Federal Crop Insurance Act, as amended (7 U.S.C. 1516),

\$200,502,000: *Provided*, That not to exceed \$700 shall be available for official reception and representation expenses, as authorized by 7 U.S.C. 1506(i).

FEDERAL CROP INSURANCE CORPORATION FUND

For payments as authorized by section 508(b) of the Federal Crop Insurance Act, as amended, \$135,000,000.

COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

REIMBURSEMENT FOR NET REALIZED LOSSES

To reimburse the Commodity Credit Corporation for net realized losses sustained, but not previously reimbursed, pursuant to the Act of August 17, 1961 (15 U.S.C. 713a-11, 713a-12), \$9,195,240,000.

GENERAL SALES MANAGER

(ALLOTMENT FROM COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION)

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

Not to exceed \$6,089,000 may be transferred from the Commodity Credit Corporation funds to support the General Sales Manager who shall work to expand and strengthen sales of United States commodities (including those of the Corporation) in world markets pursuant to existing authority (including that contained in the Corporation's charter), and that such funds shall be used by the General Sales Manager to carry out the above activities. The General Sales Manager shall report directly to the Board of Directors of the Corporation of which the Secretary of Agriculture is a member. The General Sales Manager shall obtain, assimilate, and analyze all available information on developments related to private sales, as well as those funded by the Corporation, including grade and quality as sold and as delivered, including information relating to the effectiveness of greater reliance by the General Sales Manager upon loan guarantees as contrasted to direct loans for financing commercial export sales of agricultural commodities out of private stocks on credit terms, as provided in titles I and II of the Agricultural Trade Act of 1978, Public Law 95-501, and shall submit quarterly reports to the appropriate committees of Congress concerning such developments.

Mr. WHITTEN (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that title I be considered as read, printed in the RECORD, and open to amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any amendments or points of order to title I?

If there are no amendments to title I, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

TITLE II—RURAL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS

RURAL DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE

OFFICE OF THE UNDER SECRETARY FOR SMALL COMMUNITY AND RURAL DEVELOPMENT

For necessary salaries and expenses for the Office of the Under Secretary for Small Community and Rural Development to administer programs under the laws enacted by the Congress for the Farmers Home Administration, Rural Electrification Administration, Office of Rural Development

Policy, and Federal Crop Insurance Corporation, \$415,000.

OFFICE OF RURAL DEVELOPMENT POLICY

For necessary expenses, not otherwise provided for, of the Office of Rural Development Policy in providing leadership, coordination, and related services in carrying out the rural development activities of the Department of Agriculture, as authorized by section 603 of the Rural Development Act of 1972, as amended (7 U.S.C. 2204b); section 2 of the Rural Development Policy Act of 1980 (7 U.S.C. 1921), and grants pursuant to the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act, as amended (7 U.S.C. 1926(a)(11) and 7 U.S.C. 1932(c)), \$2,037,000: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall be available for employment pursuant to the second sentence of section 706(a) of the Organic Act of 1944 (7 U.S.C. 2225), and not to exceed \$5,000 of this appropriation shall be available for employment under 5 U.S.C. 3109.

FARMERS HOME ADMINISTRATION

RURAL HOUSING INSURANCE FUND

For direct loans and related advances pursuant to section 517(m) of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended, \$17,000,000 shall be available from funds in the Rural Housing Insurance Fund, and for insured loans as authorized by title V of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended, \$3,221,000,000; of which not less than \$3,220,000,000 shall be available for subsidized interest loans to low-income borrowers, as determined by the Secretary, and for subsequent loans to existing borrowers or to purchasers under assumption agreements or credit sales; and not to exceed \$10,000,000 to enter into collection and servicing contracts pursuant to the provisions of section 3(f)(3) of the Federal Claims Act of 1966 (31 U.S.C. 952).

During fiscal year 1986, no more than 15,000 units may be assisted under rental assistance agreements entered into or extended during the year pursuant to authority under section 521(a)(2) of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended, and the total new obligation incurred over the life of these agreements shall not exceed \$198,000,000 to be added to and merged with the authority provided for this purpose in prior fiscal years: *Provided*, That the life of the agreements entered into or extended during fiscal year 1986 shall not exceed five years.

For an additional amount to reimburse the Rural Housing Insurance Fund for interest subsidies and losses sustained in prior years, but not previously reimbursed, in carrying out the provisions of title V of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1483, 1487e, and 1490a(c)), including \$2,757,000 as authorized by section 521(c) of the Act, \$1,843,927,000, and for an additional amount as authorized by section 521(c) of the Act as may be necessary to reimburse the fund to carry out a rental assistance program under section 521(a)(2) of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended.

AGRICULTURAL CREDIT INSURANCE FUND

Loans may be insured, or made to be sold and insured, under this fund in accordance with and subject to the provisions of 7 U.S.C. 1928-1929, or guaranteed, as follows: real estate loans, \$732,000,000, including not less than \$700,000,000 for farm ownership loans of which \$200,000,000 shall be guaranteed loans; and not less than \$28,000,000 for water development, use, and conservation loans of which \$6,000,000 shall be guaranteed loans; operating loans, \$3,400,000,000 of which \$1,480,000,000 shall be guaranteed loans; and emergency insured and guaran-

teed loans in amounts necessary to meet the needs resulting from natural disasters.

For an additional amount to reimburse the Agricultural Credit Insurance Fund for interest subsidies and losses sustained in prior years, but not previously reimbursed, in carrying out the provisions of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act, as amended (7 U.S.C. 1988(a)), \$1,089,943,000.

RURAL DEVELOPMENT INSURANCE FUND

For loans to be insured, or made to be sold and insured, under this fund in accordance with and subject to the provisions of 7 U.S.C. 1928 and 86 Stat. 661-664, as follows: insured water and sewer facility loans, \$340,000,000; guaranteed industrial development loans, \$100,000,000; and insured community facility loans, \$115,000,000.

For an additional amount to reimburse the Rural Development Insurance Fund for interest subsidies and losses sustained in prior years, but not previously reimbursed, in carrying out the provisions of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act, as amended (7 U.S.C. 1988(a)), \$560,005,000.

RURAL WATER AND WASTE DISPOSAL GRANTS

For grants pursuant to sections 306(a)(2) and 306(a)(6) of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act, as amended (7 U.S.C. 1926), \$115,000,000, to remain available until expended, pursuant to section 306(d) of the above Act.

VERY LOW-INCOME HOUSING REPAIR GRANTS

For grants to the very low-income elderly for essential repairs to dwellings pursuant to section 504 of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended, \$12,500,000.

MUTUAL AND SELF-HELP HOUSING

For grants and contracts pursuant to section 523(b)(1)(A) of the Housing Act of 1949 (42 U.S.C. 1490c), \$8,000,000.

RURAL COMMUNITY FIRE PROTECTION GRANTS

For grants pursuant to section 7 of the Cooperative Forestry Assistance Act of 1978 (Public Law 95-313), \$3,250,000 to fund up to 50 per centum of the cost of organizing, training, and equipping rural volunteer fire departments.

COMPENSATION FOR CONSTRUCTION DEFECTS

For compensation for construction defects as authorized by section 509(c) of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended, \$1,000,000.

RURAL HOUSING PRESERVATION GRANTS

Funds made available by Public Laws 98-396 and 98-473 for rural housing preservation grants shall remain available through September 30, 1986.

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

For necessary expenses of the Farmers Home Administration, not otherwise provided for, in administering the programs authorized by the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act (7 U.S.C. 1921-1995), as amended; title V of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1471-1490h); the Rural Rehabilitation Corporation Trust Liquidation Act, approved May 3, 1950 (40 U.S.C. 440-444), for administering the loan program authorized by title III A of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 (Public Law 88-452 approved August 20, 1964), as amended, and such other programs for which Farmers Home Administration has the responsibility for administering, \$356,297,000, together with not more than \$3,000,000 of the charges collected in connection with the insurance of loans as authorized by section 309(e) of the Consolidat-

ed Farm and Rural Development Act, as amended, and section 517(i) of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended, or in connection with charges made on borrowers under section 502(a) of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended: *Provided*, That, in addition, not to exceed \$1,000,000 of the funds available for the various programs administered by this agency may be transferred to this appropriation for temporary field employment pursuant to the second sentence of section 706(a) of the Organic Act of 1944 (7 U.S.C. 2225), to meet unusual or heavy workload increases: *Provided further*, That not to exceed \$500,000 of this appropriation may be used for employment under 5 U.S.C. 3109: *Provided further*, That not to exceed \$1,600,000 of this appropriation shall be available for contracting with the National Rural Water Association or other equally qualified national organization for a circuit rider program to provide technical assistance for rural water systems: *Provided further*, That, in addition to any other authority that the Secretary may have to defer principal and interest and forego foreclosure, the Secretary may permit, at the request of the borrower, the deferral of principal and interest on any outstanding loan made, insured, or held by the Secretary under this title, or under the provisions of any other law administered by the Farmers Home Administration, and may forego foreclosure of any such loan, for such period as the Secretary deems necessary upon a showing by the borrower that due to circumstances beyond the borrower's control, the borrower is temporarily unable to continue making payments of such principal and interest when due without unduly impairing the standard of living of the borrower. The Secretary may permit interest that accrues during the deferral period on any loan deferred under this section to bear no interest during or after such period: *Provided further*, That if the security instrument securing such loan is foreclosed, such interest as is included in the purchase price at such foreclosure shall become part of the principal and draw interest from the date of foreclosure at the rate prescribed by law.

RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ADMINISTRATION

To carry into effect the provisions of the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, as amended (7 U.S.C. 901-950(b)), as follows:

RURAL ELECTRIFICATION AND TELEPHONE REVOLVING FUND LOAN AUTHORIZATIONS

Insured loans pursuant to the authority of section 305 of the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, as amended (7 U.S.C. 935), shall be made as follows: rural electrification loans, not less than \$650,000,000 nor more than \$1,100,000,000; and rural telephone loans, not less than \$250,000,000 nor more than \$325,000,000; to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That loans made pursuant to section 306 of that Act are in addition to these amounts but during 1986 total commitments to guarantee loans pursuant to section 306 shall be not less than \$975,000,000 nor more than \$2,345,000,000 of contingent liability for total loan principal: *Provided further*, That as a condition of approval of insured electric loans during fiscal year 1986, borrowers shall obtain concurrent supplemental financing in accordance with the applicable criteria and ratios in effect as of July 15, 1982.

REIMBURSEMENT TO THE RURAL ELECTRIFICATION AND TELEPHONE REVOLVING FUND

For an additional amount to reimburse the rural electrification and telephone re-

volving fund for interest subsidies and losses sustained in prior years, but not previously reimbursed, in carrying out the provisions of the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, as amended (7 U.S.C. 901-950(b)), \$225,395,000.

RURAL TELEPHONE BANK

For the purchase of Class A stock of the Rural Telephone Bank, \$30,000,000, to remain available until expended (7 U.S.C. 901-950(b)).

The Rural Telephone Bank is hereby authorized to make such expenditures, within the limits of funds and borrowing authority available to such corporation in accord with law, and to make such contracts and commitments without regard to fiscal year limitations as provided by section 104 of the Government Corporation Control Act, as amended, as may be necessary in carrying out its authorized programs for the current fiscal year. During 1986, and within the resources and authority available, gross obligations for the principal amount of direct loans shall be not less than \$185,000,000 nor more than \$220,000,000.

RURAL COMMUNICATION DEVELOPMENT FUND

To reimburse the Rural Communication Development Fund for interest subsidies and losses sustained in prior years, but not previously reimbursed, in making Community Antenna Television loans and loan guarantees under sections 306 and 310B of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act, as amended, \$1,203,000.

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For administrative expenses to carry out the provisions of the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, as amended (7 U.S.C. 901-950(b)), and to administer the loan and loan guarantee programs for Community Antenna Television facilities as authorized by the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act (7 U.S.C. 1921-1995), and for which commitments were made prior to fiscal year 1985, including not to exceed \$7,000 for financial and credit reports, funds for employment pursuant to the second sentence of section 706(a) of the Organic Act of 1944 (7 U.S.C. 2225), and not to exceed \$103,000 for employment under 5 U.S.C. 3109, \$30,990,000.

CONSERVATION

OFFICE OF THE ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR NATURAL RESOURCES AND ENVIRONMENT

For necessary salaries and expenses for the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Natural Resources and Environment to administer the laws enacted by the Congress for the Forest Service and the Soil Conservation Service, \$386,000.

SOIL CONSERVATION SERVICE

CONSERVATION OPERATIONS

For necessary expenses for carrying out the provisions of the Act of April 27, 1935 (16 U.S.C. 590a-590f) including preparation of conservation plans and establishment of measures to conserve soil and water (including farm irrigation and land drainage and such special measures for soil and water management as may be necessary to prevent floods and the siltation of reservoirs and to control agricultural related pollutants); operation of conservation plant materials centers; classification and mapping of soil; dissemination of information; acquisition of lands by donation, exchange, or purchase at a nominal cost not to exceed \$100; purchase and erection or alteration or improvement of permanent and temporary buildings; and operation and maintenance of aircraft, \$365,629,000; of which not less than

\$3,973,000 is for snow survey and water forecasting and not less than \$4,089,000 is for operation of the plant materials centers: *Provided*, That of the foregoing amounts \$290,204,000 is for personnel compensation and benefits and \$75,425,000 is for other expenses: *Provided further*, That the cost of any permanent building purchased, erected, or as improved, exclusive of the cost of constructing a water supply or sanitary system and connecting the same to any such building and with the exception of buildings acquired in conjunction with land being purchased for other purposes, shall not exceed \$10,000, except for one building to be constructed at a cost not to exceed \$100,000 and eight buildings to be constructed or improved at a cost not to exceed \$50,000 per building and except that alterations or improvements to other existing permanent buildings costing \$5,000 or more may be made in any fiscal year in an amount not to exceed \$2,000 per building: *Provided further*, That when buildings or other structures are erected on non-Federal land that right to use such land is obtained as provided in 7 U.S.C. 2250a: *Provided further*, That no part of this appropriation may be expended for soil and water conservation operations under the Act of April 27, 1935 (16 U.S.C. 590a-590f) in demonstration projects: *Provided further*, That this appropriation shall be available for field employment pursuant to the second sentence of section 706(a) of the Organic Act of 1944 (7 U.S.C. 2225) and not to exceed \$25,000 shall be available for employment under 5 U.S.C. 3109: *Provided further*, That qualified local engineers may be temporarily employed at per diem rates to perform the technical planning work of the Service.

RIVER BASIN SURVEYS AND INVESTIGATIONS

For necessary expenses to conduct research, investigations and surveys of the watersheds of rivers and other waterways, in accordance with section 6 of the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act approved August 4, 1954, as amended (16 U.S.C. 1006-1009), \$14,906,000: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall be available for field employment pursuant to the second sentence of section 706(a) of the Organic Act of 1944 (7 U.S.C. 2225), and not to exceed \$60,000 shall be available for employment under 5 U.S.C. 3109.

WATERSHED PLANNING

For necessary expenses for small watershed investigations and planning, in accordance with the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act, as amended (16 U.S.C. 1001-1008), \$8,922,000: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall be available for field employment pursuant to the second sentence of section 706(a) of the Organic Act of 1944 (7 U.S.C. 2225), and not to exceed \$50,000 shall be available for employment under 5 U.S.C. 3109.

WATERSHED AND FLOOD PREVENTION OPERATIONS

For necessary expenses to carry out preventive measures, including but not limited to research, engineering operations, methods of cultivation, the growing of vegetation, rehabilitation of existing works and changes in use of land, in accordance with the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act approved August 4, 1954, as amended (16 U.S.C. 1001-1005, 1007-1009), the provisions of the Act of April 27, 1935 (16 U.S.C. 590a-f), and in accordance with the provisions of laws relating to the activities of the Department, \$183,843,000 (of which \$27,617,000 shall be available for the

watersheds authorized under the Flood Control Act approved June 22, 1936 (33 U.S.C. 701, 16 U.S.C. 1006a), as amended and supplemented): *Provided*, That this appropriation shall be available for field employment pursuant to the second sentence of section 706(a) of the Organic Act of 1944 (7 U.S.C. 2225), and not to exceed \$5,000,000 shall be available for emergency measures as provided by sections 403-405 of the Agricultural Credit Act of 1978 (16 U.S.C. 2203-2205), and not to exceed \$200,000 shall be available for employment under 5 U.S.C. 3109: *Provided further*, That \$14,000,000 in loans may be insured, or made to be sold and insured, under the Agricultural Credit Insurance Fund of the Farmers Home Administration (86 Stat. 663): *Provided further*, That not to exceed \$1,000,000 of this appropriation is available to carry out the purposes of the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (Public Law 93-205), as amended, including cooperative efforts as contemplated by that Act to relocate endangered or threatened species to other suitable habitats as may be necessary to expedite project construction.

RESOURCE CONSERVATION AND DEVELOPMENT

For necessary expenses in planning and carrying out projects for resource conservation and development and for sound land use pursuant to the provisions of section 32(e) of title III of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended (7 U.S.C. 1010-1011; 76 Stat. 607), and the provisions of the Act of April 27, 1935 (16 U.S.C. 590a-f), and the provisions of the Agriculture and Food Act of 1981 (16 U.S.C. 3451-3461), \$26,320,000: *Provided*, That \$2,000,000 in loans may be insured, or made to be sold and insured, under the Agricultural Credit Insurance Fund of the Farmers Home Administration (86 Stat. 663): *Provided further*, That this appropriation shall be available for field employment pursuant to the second sentence of section 706(a) of the Organic Act of 1944 (7 U.S.C. 2225), and not to exceed \$50,000 shall be available for employment under 5 U.S.C. 3109.

GREAT PLAINS CONSERVATION PROGRAM

For necessary expenses to carry into effect a program of conservation in the Great Plains area, pursuant to section 16(b) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as added by the Act of August 7, 1956, as amended (16 U.S.C. 590p(b)), \$21,531,000, to remain available until expended.

AGRICULTURAL STABILIZATION AND CONSERVATION SERVICE

AGRICULTURAL CONSERVATION PROGRAM

For necessary expenses to carry into effect the program authorized in sections 7 to 15, 16(a), 16(f), and 17 of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act approved February 29, 1936, as amended and supplemented (16 U.S.C. 590g-590o, 590p(a), 590p(f), and 590q), and sections 1001-1004, 1006-1008, and 1010 of the Agricultural Act of 1970, as added by the Agriculture and Consumer Protection Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1501-1504, 1506-1508, and 1510), and including not to exceed \$15,000 for the preparation and display of exhibits, including such displays at State, interstate, and international fairs within the United States, \$190,000,000, to remain available until expended for agreements, excluding administration but including technical assistance and related expenses, except that no participant in the Agricultural Conservation Program shall receive more than \$3,500, except where the participants from two or more

farms or ranches join to carry out approved practices designed to conserve or improve the agricultural resources of the community: *Provided*, That no portion of the funds for the current year's program may be utilized to provide financial or technical assistance for drainage on wetlands now designated as Wetlands Types 3 (III) through 20 (XX) in United States Department of the Interior, Fish and Wildlife Circular 39, Wetlands of the United States, 1956: *Provided further*, That such amounts shall be available for the purchase of seeds, fertilizers, lime, trees, or any other conservation materials, or any soil-terracing services, and making grants thereof to agricultural producers to aid them in carrying out approved farming practices as authorized by the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended, as determined and recommended by the county committees, approved by the State committees and the Secretary, under programs provided for herein: *Provided further*, That such assistance will not be used for carrying out measures and practices that are primarily production-oriented or that have little or no conservation or pollution abatement benefits: *Provided further*, That not to exceed 5 per centum of the allocation for the current year's program for any county may, on the recommendation of such county committee and approval of the State committee, be withheld and allotted to the Soil Conservation Service for services of its technicians in formulating and carrying out the Agricultural Conservation Program in the participating counties, and shall not be utilized by the Soil Conservation Service for any purpose other than technical and other assistance in such counties, and in addition, on the recommendation of such county committee and approval of the State committee, not to exceed 1 per centum may be made available to any other Federal, State, or local public agency for the same purpose and under the same conditions: *Provided further*, That for the current year's program \$2,500,000 shall be available for technical assistance in formulating and carrying out rural environmental practices: *Provided further*, That no part of any funds available to the Department, or any bureau, office, corporation, or other agency constituting a part of such Department, shall be used in the current fiscal year for the payment of salary or travel expenses of any person who has been convicted of violating the Act entitled "An Act to prevent pernicious political activities" approved August 2, 1939, as amended, or who has been found in accordance with the provisions of title 18 U.S.C. 1913 to have violated or attempted to violate such section which prohibits the use of Federal appropriations for the payment of personal services or other expenses designed to influence in any manner a Member of Congress to favor or oppose any legislation or appropriation by Congress except upon request of any Member or through the proper official channels.

FORESTRY INCENTIVES PROGRAM

For necessary expenses, not otherwise provided for, to carry out the program of forestry incentives, as authorized in the Cooperative Forestry Assistance Act of 1978 (16 U.S.C. 2101), including technical assistance and related expenses, \$12,500,000, to remain available until expended, as authorized by that Act.

EMERGENCY CONSERVATION PROGRAM

For necessary expenses to carry into effect the program authorized in sections 401, 402, and 404 of title IV of the Agricul-

tural Credit Act of 1978 (16 U.S.C. 2201-2205), \$5,000,000, to remain available until expended, as authorized by 16 U.S.C. 2204.

Mr. WHITTEN (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that title II be considered as read, printed in the RECORD, and open to amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any amendments or points of order to title II?

Hearing none, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

TITLE III—DOMESTIC FOOD PROGRAMS

OFFICE OF THE ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR FOOD AND CONSUMER SERVICES

For necessary salaries and expenses for the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Food and Consumer Services to administer the laws enacted by the Congress for the Food and Nutrition Service and the Human Nutrition Information Service, \$350,000.

FOOD AND NUTRITION SERVICE

CHILD NUTRITION PROGRAMS

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

For necessary expenses to carry out the National School Lunch Act (42 U.S.C. 1751-1761, and 1766), and the applicable provisions other than section 3 of the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 (42 U.S.C. 1773-1785, and 1788); \$4,114,140,000, to remain available through fiscal year 1987, of which \$842,548,000 is hereby appropriated and \$3,271,592,000 shall be derived by transfer from funds available under section 32 of the Act of August 24, 1935 (7 U.S.C. 612c): *Provided*, That, of funds provided herein, \$665,015,000 shall be available only to the extent an official budget request is transmitted to the Congress: *Provided further*, That funds appropriated for the purpose of section 7 of the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 shall be allocated among the States but the distribution of such funds to an individual State is contingent upon that State's agreement to participate in studies and surveys of programs authorized under the National School Lunch Act and the Child Nutrition Act of 1966, when such studies and surveys have been directed by the Congress and requested by the Secretary of Agriculture: *Provided further*, That if the Secretary of Agriculture determines that a State's administration of any program under the National School Lunch Act or the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 (other than section 17), or the regulations issued pursuant to these Acts, is seriously deficient, and the State fails to correct the deficiency within a specified period of time, the Secretary may withhold from the State some or all of the funds allocated to the State under section 7 of the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 and under section 13(k)(1) of the National School Lunch Act; upon a subsequent determination by the Secretary that the programs are operated in an acceptable manner some or all of the funds withheld may be allocated: *Provided further*, That if the funds available for Nutrition Education and Training grants authorized under section 19 of the Child Nutrition Act of 1966, as amended, require a ratable reduction in those grants, the minimum grant for each State shall be \$50,000: *Provided further*, That only final reimbursement claims for service of meals, supple-

ments, and milk submitted to State agencies by eligible schools, summer camps, institutions, and service institutions within sixty days following the month for which the reimbursement is claimed shall be eligible for reimbursement from funds appropriated under this Act. States may receive program funds appropriated under this Act for meals, supplements, and milk served during any month only if the final program operations report for such month is submitted to the Department within ninety days following that month. Exceptions to these claims or reports submission requirements may be made at the discretion of the Secretary.

SPECIAL MILK PROGRAM

For necessary expenses to carry out the special milk program, as authorized by section 3 of the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 (42 U.S.C. 1772), \$11,500,000, to remain available through September 30, 1987: *Provided*, That only final reimbursement claims for milk submitted to State agencies within sixty days following the month for which the reimbursement is claimed shall be eligible for reimbursement from funds appropriated under this Act. States may receive program funds appropriated under this Act only if the final program operations report for such month is submitted to the Department within ninety days following that month. Exceptions to these claims or reports submission requirements may be made at the discretion of the Secretary.

FEEDING PROGRAM FOR WOMEN, INFANTS AND CHILDREN (WIC)

For necessary expenses to carry out the special supplemental food program as authorized by section 17 of the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 (42 U.S.C. 1786), \$1,570,000,000: *Provided*, That funds provided herein shall remain available through September 30, 1987.

COMMODITY SUPPLEMENTAL FOOD PROGRAM

For necessary expenses to carry out the commodity supplemental food program as authorized by section 4(a) of the Agriculture and Consumer Protection Act of 1973 (7 U.S.C. 612c (note)), including not less than \$2,950,000 for the projects in Detroit, New Orleans, and Des Moines, \$36,999,000: *Provided*, That funds provided herein shall remain available through September 30, 1987.

FOOD STAMP PROGRAM

For necessary expenses to carry out the Food Stamp Act (7 U.S.C. 2011-2027, 2029) \$11,891,570,000: *Provided*, That funds provided herein shall remain available through September 30, 1986, in accordance with section 18(a) of the Food Stamp Act: *Provided further*, That up to 5 per centum of the foregoing amount may be placed in reserve to be apportioned pursuant to section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, for use only in such amounts and at such times as may become necessary to carry out program operations: *Provided further*, That funds provided herein shall be expended in accordance with section 16 of the Food Stamp Act: *Provided further*, That this appropriation shall be subject to any work registration or workfare requirements as may be required by law: *Provided further*, That \$345,000,000 of the funds provided herein shall be available only to the extent necessary after the Secretary has employed the regulatory and administrative methods available to him under the law to curtail fraud, waste and abuse in the program.

NUTRITION ASSISTANCE FOR PUERTO RICO

For monthly payments to the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico for nutrition assistance as authorized by 7 U.S.C. 2028, \$825,000,000.

FOOD DONATIONS PROGRAMS

For necessary expenses to carry out section 4(a) of the Agriculture and Consumer Protection Act of 1973 (7 U.S.C. 612c (note)) and section 4(b) of the Food Stamp Act (7 U.S.C. 2013), \$187,622,000.

TEMPORARY EMERGENCY FOOD ASSISTANCE PROGRAM

For necessary expenses to carry out the Temporary Emergency Food Assistance Act of 1983, as amended, \$50,000,000: *Provided*, That, in accordance with section 202 of Public Law 98-92, these funds shall be available only if the Secretary determines the existence of excess commodities.

FOOD PROGRAM ADMINISTRATION

For necessary administrative expenses of the Domestic Food Programs funded under this Act, \$82,502,000; of which \$5,000,000 shall be available only for simplifying procedures, reducing overhead costs, tightening regulations, improving food stamp coupon handling, and assistance in the prevention, identification and prosecution of fraud and other violations of law: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall be available for employment pursuant to the second sentence of section 706(a) of the Organic Act of 1944 (7 U.S.C. 2225), and not to exceed \$150,000 shall be available for employment under 5 U.S.C. 3109.

HUMAN NUTRITION INFORMATION SERVICE

For necessary expenses to enable the Human Nutrition Information Service to perform applied research and demonstrations relating to human nutrition and consumer use and economies of food utilization, \$13,562,000: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall be available for employment pursuant to the second sentence of section 706(a) of the Organic Act of 1944 (7 U.S.C. 2225).

Mr. WHITTEN (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that title III be considered as read, printed in the RECORD, and open to amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there amendments or points of order to title III?

Hearing none, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

TITLE IV—INTERNATIONAL PROGRAMS

FOREIGN AGRICULTURAL SERVICE

For necessary expenses of the Foreign Agricultural Service, including carrying out title VI of the Agricultural Act of 1954, as amended (7 U.S.C. 1761-1768), market development activities abroad, and for enabling the Secretary to coordinate and integrate activities of the Department in connection with foreign agricultural work, including not to exceed \$110,000 for representation allowances and for expenses pursuant to section 8 of the Act approved August 3, 1956 (7 U.S.C. 1766), \$83,547,000: *Provided*, That not less than \$255,000 of the funds contained in this appropriation shall be available to obtain statistics and related facts on foreign production and full and complete information on methods used by other coun-

tries to move farm commodities in world trade on a competitive basis.

PUBLIC LAW 480

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

For expenses during the current fiscal year, not otherwise recoverable, and unrecovered prior years' costs, including interest thereon, under the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, as amended (7 U.S.C. 1691, 1701-1715, 1721-1726, 1727-1727f, 1731-1736g), as follows: (1) financing the sale of agricultural commodities for convertible foreign currencies and for dollars on credit terms pursuant to titles I and III of said Act, not more than \$1,030,000,000; of which \$657,000,000 is hereby appropriated and the balance derived from proceeds from sales of foreign currencies and dollar loan repayments, repayments on long-term credit sales and carryover balances, and (2) commodities supplied in connection with dispositions abroad, pursuant to title II of said Act, not more than \$650,000,000, of which \$650,000,000 is hereby appropriated: *Provided*, That not to exceed 10 per centum of the funds made available to carry out any title of this paragraph may be used to carry out any other title of this paragraph.

OFFICE OF INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION AND DEVELOPMENT

For necessary expenses of the Office of International Cooperation and Development to coordinate, plan, and direct activities involving international development, technical assistance and training, and international scientific and technical cooperation in the Department of Agriculture, including those authorized by the Food and Agriculture Act of 1977 (7 U.S.C. 3291), \$3,917,000; and the Office may utilize advances of funds, or reimburse this appropriation for expenditures made on behalf of Federal agencies, public and private organizations and institutions under agreements executed pursuant to the agricultural food production assistance programs (7 U.S.C. 1736) and the foreign assistance programs of the International Development Cooperation Administration (22 U.S.C. 2392).

Mr. WHITTEN (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that title IV be considered as read, printed in the RECORD, and open to amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there amendments or points of order to title IV?

Hearing none, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

TITLE V—RELATED AGENCIES

FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Food and Drug Administration; for rental of special purpose space in the District of Columbia or elsewhere; and for miscellaneous and emergency expenses of enforcement activities, authorized and approved by the Secretary and to be accounted for solely on the Secretary's certificate, not to exceed \$25,000; \$390,225,000: *Provided*, That none of the funds in this Act shall be used to develop, establish, or operate any program of user fees authorized by 31 U.S.C. 9701.

BUILDINGS AND FACILITIES

For plans, construction, repair, improvement, extension, alteration, and purchase of

fixed equipment or facilities of or used by the Food and Drug Administration, where not otherwise provided, \$1,450,000.

STANDARD LEVEL USER CHARGES (FDA)

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

For payment of Standard Level User Charges pursuant to Public Law 92-313 for programs and activities of the Food and Drug Administration which are included in this Act, \$25,888,000: *Provided*, That in the event the Food and Drug Administration should require modification of space needs, a share of the salaries and expenses appropriation may be transferred to this appropriation, or a share of this appropriation may be transferred to the salaries and expenses appropriation, but such transfers shall not exceed 10 per centum of the funds made available for Standard Level User Charges to or from this account.

COMMODITY FUTURES TRADING COMMISSION

For necessary expenses to carry out the provisions of the Commodity Exchange Act, as amended (7 U.S.C. 1 et seq.), including the purchase and hire of passenger motor vehicles; the rental of space (to include multiple year leases) in the District of Columbia and elsewhere; and not to exceed \$25,000 for employment under 5 U.S.C. 3109; \$28,416,000; including not to exceed \$700 for official reception and representation expenses.

FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION

LIMITATION ON REVOLVING FUND FOR ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

Not to exceed \$21,175,000 (from assessments collected from farm credit system banks) shall be obligated during the current fiscal year for administrative expenses, as authorized under 12 U.S.C. 2249.

Mr. WHITTEN (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that title V be considered as read, printed in the RECORD, and open to amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any points of order against title V?

Are there amendments to title V?

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. WHITTEN

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WHITTEN: On page 54, line 2, strike "\$390,225,000" and insert "\$392,370,000".

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is offered on behalf of the subcommittee.

Mr. Chairman, we have been advised by Secretary Heckler that budget amendments are now pending at the Office of Management and Budget to increase the resources devoted to work on acquired immune deficiency syndrome [AIDS].

These amendments involve the Centers for Disease Control, the National Institutes of Health, the Alcohol, Drug Abuse, and Mental Health Administration, and the Food and Drug Administration, a total of \$37.8 million.

The amendment I offer on behalf of the Committee increases the Committee's recommendation for FDA, by \$2,145,000, the full amount of the pending budget amendment. The resources for the other agencies will be addressed in the Labor-HHS Appropriation bill.

We have not yet received the budget amendments, but the paperwork is being processed by OMB, and should be submitted soon. This money will be used to develop and improve screening tests for AIDS, to assure the safety of the Nation's blood supply, to clarify the possible transmissibility of AIDS through food, and to review and approve new diagnostic and treatment products.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to my colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO].

Mr. FAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the bill, which goes such a long way to improve agricultural programs for the State of California in relation to the administration's budget submission, and I am particularly pleased to see the committee's action in regard to AIDS.

Mr. Chairman, I commend the subcommittee for adding the \$2 million to the budget of the Food and Drug Administration to expedite the availability of diagnostic kits for potential AIDS victims across the country.

This wise and humane decision is another example of the broad support that exists in Congress for the limitation and eventual eradication of acquired immune deficiency syndrome.

As most Americans now know, the threat to public health has now clearly been extended to include every element of our population. This bill and the measure yet to come before us from the subcommittee responsible for health appropriations show significant progress in broadening the funding base for this terrible unsolved problem.

Mrs. SMITH of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, this side supports the amendment.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Chairman, I should like to express my strong support for this urgently needed amendment to H.R. 3037, the fiscal year 1986 Agriculture Appropriation bill, and I commend the committee, and particularly its chairman and ranking minority member for offering it. This amendment will provide an additional \$2.145 million to the Food and Drug Administration [FDA] for activities to combat acquired immune deficiency syndrome [AIDS].

The Secretary of Health and Human Services [HHS] has informed the Appropriations Committee that these additional funds are essential for optimal progress in fighting this deadly epidemic. This past Friday, July 19, 1985, the Department finally responded to congressional requests for revised rec-

ommendations for funding and resources necessary in fiscal year 1986 for the Public Health Service [PHS] to deal effectively with this problem. The FDA will use these additional funds in part to expand activities related to the blood test for antibodies to the HTLV-III virus, which is believed to cause AIDS, to ensure the safety of the Nation's blood supply. Other FDA activities include studying the possibility of AIDS transmission through food, and evaluating diagnostic and treatment products, including an eventual vaccine against the HTLV-III virus.

There have been almost 4,000 AIDS cases reported thus far in 1985 alone. Over 1,000 cases have been reported in New York City, which has had the greatest number of AIDS cases in the country, 33 percent. According to the Centers for Disease Control [CDC], there have been 11,871 known cases of AIDS in the United States to date and the number of cases is doubling every year. Seventy-five percent of AIDS patients diagnosed prior to January 1983 are now dead.

At present, there is no treatment or cure for AIDS. Clearly, it is vital that we provide the necessary resources to fight this disease, for AIDS victims, for their families, and to protect the public health. The funds provided in this amendment are within the section 302(b) allocation. This is a small price to pay for a potentially great breakthrough in our efforts to fight AIDS. I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN].

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there further amendments to title V?

If not, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

TITLE VI—GENERAL PROVISIONS

Sec. 601. The expenditure of any appropriation under this Act for any consulting service through procurement contract, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 3109, shall be limited to those contracts where such expenditures are a matter of public record and available for public inspection, except where otherwise provided under existing law, or under existing Executive Order issued pursuant to existing law.

Sec. 602. Within the unit limit of cost fixed by law, appropriations and authorizations made for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year 1986 under this Act shall be available for the purchase, in addition to those specifically provided for, of not to exceed seven hundred thirty-four (734) passenger motor vehicles of which seven hundred six (706) shall be for replacement only, and for the hire of such vehicles.

Sec. 603. Funds in this Act available to the Department of Agriculture shall be available for uniforms or allowances therefore as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 5901-5902).

Sec. 604. Not less than \$1,500,000 of the appropriations of the Department of Agriculture in this Act for research and service work authorized by the Acts of August 14,

1946, July 28, 1954, and September 6, 1958 (7 U.S.C. 427, 1621-1629; 42 U.S.C. 1891-1893), shall be available for contracting in accordance with said Acts.

Sec. 605. No part of the funds contained in this Act may be used to make production or other payments to a person, persons, or corporations who harvest or knowingly permit to be harvested for illegal use, marihuana, or other such prohibited drug-producing plants on any part of lands owned or controlled by such persons or corporations.

Sec. 606. Advances of money from any appropriation in this Act for the Department of Agriculture may be made by authority of the Secretary of Agriculture to chiefs of field parties.

Sec. 607. The cumulative total of transfers to the Working Capital Fund for the purpose of accumulating growth capital for data services and National Finance Center operations shall not exceed \$2,000,000: *Provided*, That no funds in this Act appropriated to an agency of the Department shall be transferred to the Working Capital Fund without the approval of the agency administrator: *Provided further*, That not to exceed \$40,001,000 shall be charged against the Working Capital Fund for personnel compensation and benefits.

Sec. 608. New obligational authority provided for the following appropriation items in this Act shall remain available until expended: Public Law 480; Mutual and Self-Help Housing; Watershed and Flood Prevention Operations; Resource Conservation and Development; Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Buildings and Facilities; Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service Salaries and Expenses funds made available to county committees; the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation Fund; and Buildings and Facilities, Food and Drug Administration.

Sec. 609. No part of any appropriation contained in this Act shall remain available for obligation beyond the current fiscal year unless expressly so provided herein.

Sec. 610. Not to exceed \$50,000 of the appropriation available to the Department of Agriculture in this Act shall be available to provide appropriate orientation and language training pursuant to Public Law 94-449.

Sec. 611. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, employees of the agencies of the Department of Agriculture, including employees of the Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation county committees, may be utilized to provide part-time and intermittent assistance to other agencies of the Department, without reimbursement, during periods when they are not otherwise full utilized, and ceilings on full-time equivalent staff years established for or by the Department of Agriculture shall exclude overtime as well as staff years expended as a result of carrying out programs associated with natural disasters, such as forest fires, droughts, floods, and other acts of God.

Sec. 612. Funds provided by this Act for personnel compensation and benefits shall be available for obligation for that purpose only.

Sec. 613. No part of any appropriation contained in this Act shall be expended by any executive agency, as referred to in the Office of Federal Procurement Policy Act (41 U.S.C. 401 et seq.), pursuant to any obligation for services by contract, unless such executive agency has awarded and entered into such contract as provided by law.

Sec. 614. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act

shall be available to implement, administer, or enforce any regulation which has been disapproved pursuant to a resolution of disapproval duly adopted in accordance with the applicable law of the United States.

Sec. 615. Certificates of beneficial ownership sold by the Farmers Home Administration in connection with the Agricultural Credit Insurance Fund, Rural Housing Insurance Fund, and the Rural Development Insurance Fund shall be not less than 75 per centum of the value of the loans closed during the fiscal year.

Sec. 616. No funds appropriated by this Act may be used to pay negotiated indirect cost rates on cooperative agreements or similar arrangements between the United States Department of Agriculture and non-profit institutions in excess of 10 per centum of the total direct cost of the agreement when the purpose of such cooperative arrangements is to carry out programs of mutual interest between the two parties. This does not preclude appropriate payment of indirect costs on grants and contracts with such institutions when such indirect costs are computed on a similar basis for all agencies for which appropriations are provided in this Act.

Sec. 617. None of the funds in this Act shall be used to carry out any activity related to phasing out the Resource Conservation and Development Program.

Sec. 618. None of the funds in this Act shall be used to prevent or interfere with the right and obligation of the Commodity Credit Corporation to sell surplus agricultural commodities in world trade at competitive prices as authorized by law.

Sec. 619. Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, commodities acquired by the Department in connection with Commodity Credit Corporation and section 32 price support operations may be used, as authorized by law (15 U.S.C. 714c and 7 U.S.C. 612c), to provide commodities to individuals in cases of hardship as determined by the Secretary of Agriculture.

Sec. 620. During fiscal year 1986, notwithstanding any other provision of law, no funds may be paid out of the Treasury of the United States or out of any fund of a Government corporation to any private individual or corporation in satisfaction of any assurance agreement or payment guarantee or other form of loan guarantee entered into by any agency or corporation of the United States Government with respect to loans made and credits extended to the Polish People's Republic, unless the Polish People's Republic has been declared to be in default of its debt to such individual or corporation or unless the President has provided a monthly written report to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President of the Senate explaining the manner in which the national interest of the United States has been served by any payments during the previous month under loan guarantee or credit assurance agreement with respect to loans made or credits extended to the Polish People's Republic in the absence of a declaration of default.

Sec. 621. None of the funds in this Act shall be available to reimburse the General Services Administration for payment of Standard Level User Charges in excess of the amounts specified in this Act.

Sec. 622. In fiscal year 1986, the Secretary of Agriculture shall initiate construction on not less than twenty new projects under the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act (Public Law 566) and not less than five new projects under the Flood Control Act (Public Law 534).

Sec. 623. Funds provided by this Act may be used for translation of publications of the Department of Agriculture into foreign languages when determined by the Secretary to be in the public interest.

Sec. 624. None of the funds appropriated by this or any other Act may be used to relocate the Hawaii State Office of the Farmers Home Administration from Hilo, Hawaii, to Honolulu, Hawaii.

Sec. 625. Provisions of law prohibiting or restricting personal services contracts shall not apply to veterinarians employed by the Department to take animal blood samples, test and vaccinate animals, and perform branding and tagging activities on a fee-for-service basis.

Sec. 626. None of the funds provided in this Act may be used to reduce programs by establishing an end-of-year employment ceiling on full-time equivalent staff years below the level set herein for the following agencies: Farmers Home Administration, 12,400; Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service, 2,550; and Soil Conservation Service, 14,177.

Sec. 627. Funds provided in this Act may be used for one-year contracts which are to be performed in two fiscal years so long as the total amount for such contracts is obligated in the year for which the funds are appropriated.

Sec. 628. Funds appropriated by this Act shall be applied only to the objects for which the appropriations were made except as otherwise provided by law, as required by 31 U.S.C. 1301.

CONTENTS

TITLE I—AGRICULTURAL PROGRAMS PRODUCTION, PROCESSING AND MARKETING

	Page
Office of the Secretary.....	2
Office of the Assistant Secretary for Administration.....	2
Standard Level User Charges (USDA).....	2
Building Operations and Maintenance.....	3
Advisory Committees (USDA).....	3
Departmental Administration.....	3
Working Capital Fund.....	4
Office of the Assistant Secretary for Governmental and Public Affairs... ..	4
Public Affairs.....	4
Legislative Liaison.....	5
Intergovernmental Affairs.....	5
Office of the Inspector General.....	5
Office of the General Counsel.....	6
Office of the Assistant Secretary for Economics.....	6
Economic Research Service.....	6
Statistical Reporting Service.....	8
World Agricultural Outlook Board... ..	8
Office of the Assistant Secretary for Science and Education.....	9
Agricultural Research Service.....	9
Buildings and Facilities.....	11
Cooperative State Research Service.. ..	12
Extension Service.....	14
National Agricultural Library.....	16
Office of the Assistant Secretary for Marketing and Inspection Services.. ..	16
Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service.....	17
Buildings and Facilities.....	18
Food Safety and Inspection Service... ..	18
Federal Grain Inspection Service.....	19
Inspection and weighing services limitation on administrative expenses.....	20
Agricultural Cooperative Service.....	20
Agricultural Marketing Service: Marketing Services.....	21

Limitation on administrative expenses.....	21
Funds for Strengthening Markets, Income, and Supply (Section 32). Payments to States and Possessions.....	22
Office of Transportation.....	22
Packers and Stockyards Administration.....	23

FARM INCOME STABILIZATION

Office of the Under Secretary for International Affairs and Commodity Programs.....	23
Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service: Salaries and Expenses.....	23
Dairy Indemnity Program.....	25
Federal Crop Insurance Corporation: Administrative and Operating Expenses.....	26
Federal Crop Insurance Corporation Fund.....	27
Commodity Credit Corporation: Reimbursement for Net Realized Losses.....	27
General Sales Manager.....	27

TITLE II—RURAL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS

RURAL DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE

Office of the Under Secretary for Small Community and Rural Development.....	28
Office of Rural Development Policy.. ..	28
Farmers Home Administration: Rural Housing Insurance Fund.....	29
Agricultural Credit Insurance Fund.....	30
Rural Development Insurance Fund.....	31
Rural Water and Waste Disposal Grants.....	32
Very Low-Income Housing Repair Grants.....	32
Mutual and Self-Help Housing.....	32
Rural Community Fire Protection Grants.....	32
Compensation for Construction Defects.....	33
Rural Housing Preservation Grants.....	33
Salaries and Expenses.....	33
Rural Electrification Administration: Rural Electrification and Telephone Revolving Fund Loan Authorizations.....	35
Rural Telephone Bank.....	36
Rural Communication Development Fund.....	37
Salaries and Expenses.....	37

CONSERVATION

Office of the Assistant Secretary for Natural Resources and Environment.....	37
Soil Conservation Service: Conservation Operations.....	38
River Basin Surveys and Investigations.....	39
Watershed Planning.....	40
Watershed and Flood Prevention Operations.....	40
Resource Conservation and Development.....	41
Great Plains Conservation Program.....	42
Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service: Agricultural Conservation Program.....	42
Forestry Incentives Program.....	45
Emergency Conservation Program.. ..	45

TITLE III—DOMESTIC FOOD PROGRAMS

Office of the Assistant Secretary for Food and Consumer Services.....	46
Food and Nutrition Service:	
Child Nutrition Programs	46
Special Milk Program	48
Feeding Program for Women, Infants and Children (WIC)	48
Commodity Supplemental Food Program	49
Food Stamp Program	49
Nutrition Assistance for Puerto Rico	50
Food Donations Programs	50
Temporary Emergency Food Assistance Program	50
Food Program Administration	50
Human Nutrition Information Service	51

TITLE IV—INTERNATIONAL PROGRAMS

Foreign Agricultural Service	51
Public Law 480	52
Office of International Cooperation and Development	53

TITLE V—RELATED AGENCIES

Food and Drug Administration:	
Salaries and Expenses	53
Buildings and Facilities	54
Standard Level User Charges (FDA)	54
Commodity Futures Trading Commission	54
Farm Credit Administration—Limitation on Revolving Fund for Administrative Expenses	55

TITLE VI

General Provisions	55
--------------------------	----

Mr. WHITTEN (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that title VI be considered as read, printed in the RECORD, and open to amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any points of order or amendments to title VI?

The Chair hears none.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with an amendment, with the recommendation that the amendment be agreed to and that the bill, as amended, do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. MURTHA] having assumed the chair, Mr. VENTO, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 3037) making appropriations for Agriculture, Rural Development, and Related Agencies programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1986, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with an amendment, with the recommendation that the amendment be agreed to and that the bill, as amended, do pass.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

Mr. LUNGREN. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device and there were—yeas 354, nays 71, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 254]

YEAS—354

Ackerman	Coleman (TX)	Gonzalez
Addabbo	Collins	Gordon
Akaka	Combest	Gray (IL)
Alexander	Conte	Gray (PA)
Andrews	Conyers	Green
Annunzio	Cooper	Guarini
Anthony	Coyne	Gunderson
Applegate	Craig	Hall (OH)
Aspin	Crockett	Hall, Ralph
Atkins	Daniel	Hamilton
AuCoin	Darden	Hammerschmidt
Barnard	Daschle	Hartnett
Barnes	Daub	Hatcher
Barton	Davis	Hawkins
Bateman	de la Garza	Hayes
Bedell	Dellums	Heftel
Beilenson	Derrick	Hendon
Bennett	Dickinson	Hillis
Bentley	Dicks	Hopkins
Bereuter	Dingell	Horton
Berman	DioGuardi	Howard
Bevill	Dixon	Hoyer
Blaggi	Dorgan (ND)	Hubbard
Billirakis	Dowdy	Huckaby
Billie	Duncan	Hutto
Boehlert	Durbin	Jeffords
Boggs	Dwyer	Jenkins
Boland	Dymally	Johnson
Boner (TN)	Dyson	Jones (NC)
Bonior (MI)	Early	Jones (OK)
Bonker	Eckart (OH)	Jones (TN)
Borski	Edgar	Kanjorski
Bosco	Edwards (CA)	Kaptur
Boucher	Edwards (OK)	Kasich
Boulter	Emerson	Kastenmeier
Boxer	English	Kemp
Breaux	Erdreich	Kennelly
Brooks	Evans (IA)	Kildee
Broomfield	Evans (IL)	Kindness
Brown (CA)	Fascell	Kiecicka
Brown (CO)	Fazio	Kolbe
Broyhill	Feighan	Kolter
Bruce	Fiedler	Kostmayer
Bryant	Fish	Kramer
Burton (CA)	Filippo	LaFalce
Bustamante	Florio	Lantos
Byron	Foglietta	Latta
Callahan	Foley	Leach (IA)
Campbell	Ford (MI)	Leath (TX)
Carper	Ford (TN)	Lehman (CA)
Carr	Fowler	Lehman (FL)
Chandler	Franklin	Leland
Chappell	Frost	Levin (MI)
Chapple	Fuqua	Levine (CA)
Clay	Garcia	Lewis (CA)
Clinger	Gaydos	Lewis (FL)
Coats	Gephardt	Lightfoot
Cobey	Gibbons	Lipinski
Coble	Gilman	Livingston
Coelho	Gingrich	Lloyd
Coleman (MO)	Glickman	Loeffler

Long	Pease	Spratt
Lott	Penny	St Germain
Lowery (CA)	Pepper	Staggers
Lowry (WA)	Perkins	Stallings
Lundine	Petri	Stangeland
MacKay	Pickle	Stark
Madigan	Porter	Stenholm
Manton	Price	Stokes
Markey	Quillen	Strang
Marlenee	Rahall	Stratton
Martin (NY)	Rangel	Sundquist
Martinez	Ray	Sweeney
Matsui	Regula	Swift
Mavroules	Reid	Swindall
Mazzoli	Richardson	Synar
McCain	Ridge	Tallon
McCloskey	Rinaldo	Tauke
McCurdy	Roberts	Tauzin
McDade	Robinson	Taylor
McEwen	Rodino	Thomas (CA)
McHugh	Roe	Thomas (GA)
McKernan	Roemer	Torres
McKinney	Rogers	Torricelli
McMillan	Rose	Towns
Meyers	Rostenkowski	Trafficant
Mica	Roth	Traxler
Mikulski	Rowland (GA)	Udall
Miller (CA)	Roybal	Valentine
Miller (OH)	Rudd	Vander Jagt
Mineta	Russo	Vento
Mitchell	Sabo	Visclosky
Moakley	Savage	Volkmer
Mollohan	Schaefer	Walgren
Montgomery	Scheuer	Watkins
Moody	Schneider	Waxman
Moore	Schroeder	Weaver
Morrison (CT)	Schuette	Weber
Morrison (WA)	Schumer	Weiss
Mrazek	Seiberling	Wheat
Murphy	Sharp	Whitehurst
Murtha	Shelby	Whitley
Myers	Sikorski	Whittaker
Natcher	Siljander	Whitten
Neal	Sisisky	Williams
Nichols	Skeen	Wilson
Nowak	Skelton	Wirth
O'Brien	Slatery	Wise
Oaker	Slaughter	Wolf
Oberstar	Smith (FL)	Wolpe
Obey	Smith (IA)	Wortley
Olin	Smith (NE)	Wright
Ortiz	Smith (NJ)	Wylie
Owens	Smith, Robert	Yates
Oxley	Snowe	Yatron
Panetta	Snyder	Young (AK)
Parris	Solarz	Young (FL)
Pashayan	Spence	Young (MO)

NAYS—71

Anderson	Gradison	Molinari
Archer	Gregg	Moorhead
Armey	Grotberg	Nelson
Badham	Hansen	Nielson
Bartlett	Henry	Packard
Bates	Hertel	Pursell
Burton (IN)	Hiler	Ritter
Carney	Hughes	Roukema
Cheney	Hunter	Rowland (CT)
Coughlin	Hyde	Saxton
Courter	Ireland	Schulze
Crane	Jacobs	Sensenbrenner
Dannemeyer	Lagomarsino	Shaw
DeLay	Lent	Shumway
DeWine	Lujan	Shuster
Dornan (CA)	Luken	Smith (NH)
Dreier	Lungren	Smith, Denny
Eckert (NY)	Mack	Solomon
Fawell	Martin (IL)	Stump
Fields	McCandless	Vucanovich
Frank	McCollum	Walker
Frenzel	McGrath	Wyden
Gallo	Michel	Zschau
Goodling	Miller (WA)	

NOT VOTING—8

Donnelly	Gekas	Monson
Downey	Hefner	Studds
Gejdenson	Holt	

□ 1700

The Clerk announced the following pair:

On this vote:

Mr. Gejdenson for, with Mr. Monson against.

Messrs. GOODLING, LUKEN, and FRANK changed their votes from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. ANTHONY and Mr. SWEENEY changed their votes from "nay" to "yea".

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2121, COASTAL ZONE MANAGEMENT REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 1985

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 214 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 214

Resolved, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 1(b) of rule XXIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 2121) to provide for the reauthorization of the Coastal Zone Management Act of 1972, and for other purposes, and the first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed one hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries now printed in the bill as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule, and each section of said substitute shall be considered as having been read. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

□ 1710

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MOAKLEY] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield the customary 30 minutes, for the purpose of debate only, to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. LOTT], and pending that I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 214 is an open rule providing for the consideration of H.R. 2121, the Coastal Zone Management Reauthorization Act of

1985. The rule provides for 1 hour of general debate to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

The rule makes in order an amendment in the nature of a substitute which is recommended by the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries and is now printed in the bill. This amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as original text for the purpose of amendment under the 5-minute rule and is to be considered by section with each section to be considered as read. Finally, Mr. Speaker the rule provides for one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 2121 is the bill to reauthorize the Coastal Zone Management Act. This act was first established in 1972 to encourage coastal States and communities to consolidate their efforts in the management of coastal resources, including natural, commercial, and ecological resources. H.R. 2121, the Coastal Zone Management Reauthorization Act of 1985, would authorize the appropriation of funds for fiscal years 1986 through 1991.

Mr. Speaker, the act would provide financial incentives for States to develop coastal management programs. The two main incentives that Congress provided in the Coastal Zone Management Act are Federal financial assistance of up to 80 percent of program cost for developing and implementing State coastal zone management programs, and providing grants to States to assist in the administration of federally approved programs.

Since the passage of the Coastal Zone Management Act, all 35 eligible States and territories have participated and 28 have voluntarily developed federally approved programs. The involvement of these States is the reason why the Coastal Zone Management Act has been so successful in accomplishing its goals.

Mr. Speaker, other provisions of H.R. 2121 would allow the Secretary of Commerce to make grants under sections 306 and 306A of the bill to coastal States, provided those grants are matched by a State contribution of 20 percent of the grant for fiscal year 1986, 30 percent of the grant for fiscal year 1987, 40 percent of the grant for fiscal year 1988, and 50 percent of the grant for each year thereafter. This phased decrease in the Federal share of grants would result in a 50/50 State-Federal partnership beginning in fiscal year 1989 and beyond. This provision in the bill would reflect the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries' position that one of the major purposes of the act is to get coastal States to develop their own coastal management programs.

Mr. Speaker, the cost of these grant programs would be \$40 million in fiscal year 1986 and would be scaled down to \$35 million a year for fiscal years 1989 through 1991. This reduction in the authorization level will result in a savings of \$99 million to the Federal Treasury over the 6 years. This reduction would require the States to pick up the cost of administering their coastal management programs over the period covered by this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 2121 also changes the structure of the national program protecting inland salt water bodies. Through this program over 261,000 acres of salt water marshes, and shorelines, are being preserved for long-term research and public educational activities.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. JONES], and also members of both sides of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries for their bipartisan effort in bringing a bill to the House floor that will continue to protect our Nation's coastal areas.

Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of House Resolution 214 so that the House may proceed on this important legislation.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 214 provides for the consideration of H.R. 2121 which reauthorizes the Coastal Zone Management Act of 1972 for 6 years. The rule provides for 1 hour of general debate divided between the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Following general debate, the bill will be considered for amendment under the 5-minute rule with the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute considered as an original bill for the purpose of amendment. Finally, the rule provides for the motion to recommit with or without instructions.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 2121 authorizes the appropriation of funds for fiscal years 1986 through 1991 to carry out the purposes of the Coastal Zone Management Act. The authorization levels are on a declining scale to reflect the progress individual coastal States have made in developing and implementing their own management programs.

Under the provisions of H.R. 2121, the annual authorization level for basic State coastal zone management grants for administration of coastal management programs is \$40 million in fiscal year 1986, gradually declining to \$35 million annually in fiscal years 1989 through 1991. The bill also includes substantive changes in the act to require States to provide funding for a greater share of coastal management program costs. Under current

law, the Federal Government is responsible for up to 80 percent of such costs. H.R. 2121 would reduce the Federal share to no more than 50 percent in each year after fiscal year 1988. H.R. 2121 also reauthorizes Federal grants to States for low-cost construction and port development and the estuarine reserve system at \$9 million a year.

Mr. Speaker, this authorization will continue the States' longstanding efforts to rejuvenate America's coasts, which have an effect on every State in the Nation. Today, our oceans and Great Lakes are home to more than one out of every two Americans. By the year 2000, experts predict that nearly 80 percent of the U.S. population will live within an hour's drive of a seashore, lakefront or coastal area. The coastal States' record of success as caretakers of the Nation's vast coastal resources is proof that the Coastal Zone Management Act is working, and working remarkably well. Great progress has been made in managing coastal development, promoting economic development, restoring urban waterfronts, managing coastal resources, improving public access, enhancing marine and freshwater resources, working with Federal agencies, protecting lives and property—the list goes on and on.

Mr. Speaker, since passage of the Coastal Zone Management Act, all 35 eligible States and territories have participated and 28, including my own State of Mississippi, have developed federally approved programs. In passing the act in 1972, the overwhelming vote in favor of the final bill—376 to 6 in the House and 68 to 0 in the Senate—signaled a strong congressional mandate for national coastal zone management.

We are entering a crucial period where activities in the Nation's coastal regions are intensifying, requiring skillful management from all sectors, public and private. The Coastal Zone Management Act is the only comprehensive tool which allows Federal, State, and local governments to cooperatively manage the beaches, bays, wetlands, ports and harbors, estuaries, islands, and fisheries of our Nation's coastal areas. If these grants are eliminated, most States would not have the financial resources to adequately administer their coastal management programs or meet the act's important national policy objectives.

Mr. Speaker, this bill was reported by unanimous voice vote and there were no additional views filed. I therefore strongly urge the adoption of this rule so we can proceed with the consideration of this very important Coastal Zone Management Reauthorization Act.

Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 10, NATIONAL DEVELOPMENT INVESTMENT ACT

Mr. BEILENSEN. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 223 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 223

Resolved, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 1(b) of rule XXIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 10) to amend the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 and the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965, and the first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against the consideration of the bill for failure to comply with the provisions of section 402(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (Public Law 93-344) are hereby waived. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed one hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Public Works and Transportation, the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule by titles instead of by sections, and each title shall be considered as having been read. Immediately after the enacting clause of the bill is read, it shall be in order to consider, before any other amendments, the amendments printed in the Congressional Record of July 11, 1985, by Representative Howard of New Jersey, if offered by Representative Howard or his designee, said amendments shall be considered en bloc and shall be in order although amending portions of the bill not yet read for amendment, and said amendments shall not be subject to a demand for a division of the question in the House or in Committee of the Whole. Said amendments shall not be subject to amendment but shall be debatable for not to exceed twenty minutes, to be equally divided and controlled by the proponent of the amendment and a Member opposed thereto. If said amendments are adopted, it shall be in order to consider the bill, as modified by said amendments, which shall be considered to have been adopted in the House and in the Committee of the Whole, as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule by titles instead of by sections, and each title shall be considered as having been read. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments, as may have been adopted, and the previous questions shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

□ 1720

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California [Mr. BEILENSEN] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. BEILENSEN. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. QUILLEN] pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume.

House Resolution 223 is the rule providing for the consideration of H.R. 10, the National Development Investment Act and Appalachian Regional Development Act Amendments of 1985. The rule waives section 402(a) of the Congressional Budget Act against consideration of the bill and provides for 1 hour of general debate to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the committee on Public Works and Transportation. The rule further provides that the bill will be read for amendment by titles rather than sections in order that its consideration may be expedited.

The rule also makes in order the consideration of amendments by the gentleman from New Jersey and chairman of the Public Works Committee [Mr. HOWARD] that were printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of July 11, 1985. The amendments are to be considered en bloc and are to be the first amendments considered after the conclusion of general debate. The chairman's amendments are to be debatable for no more than 20 minutes and shall not be subject to amendment. House Resolution 223 provides that if the chairman's amendments are adopted by the House. The bill as modified by those amendments shall be considered as original text during proceedings under the 5-minute rule. The rule also makes in order the consideration of one motion to recommit.

Mr. Speaker, section 402(a) of the Budget Act, as Members know, prohibits the consideration of any measure that authorizes the enactment of appropriations for a fiscal year if the measure is not reported from the committees to which it was referred by May 15 preceding the fiscal year for which the authorization is made. H.R. 10, which authorizes appropriations for the coming fiscal year and for ensuing fiscal years, was referred to the Committee on Banking, Finance, and Urban Affairs as well as the Committee on Public Works. While Public Works did in fact file its report on May 15 of this year, the Banking Committee chose to take no action on the bill. Consequently, consideration of H.R. 10 by the House would be in technical violation of section 402(a) of the Budget Act.

Mr. Speaker, my colleagues will be interested to know that on June 6 of this year, the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. ST GERMAIN], who chairs

the Banking Committee, wrote the chairman of the Rules Committee requesting that a rule be granted for H.R. 10 and indicating that the Banking Committee's failure to report in no way constitutes an attempt to delay the bill's consideration. In addition, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GRAY] indicated in a letter to the Rules Committee chairman that the Budget Committee has no objection to waiving this technical violation of the Budget Act. I make these points to assure my colleagues that the waiver is recommended by the Rules Committee in light of the fact that there appears to be no opposition to its adoption.

Mr. Speaker, the amendments which Chairman HOWARD will offer to the bill will have the effect of lowering its authorization levels to those assumed in the first concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 1986 adopted by the House on May 23 of this year. The rule before the House would ensure that if the amendments are adopted, Members would retain the opportunity to further amend affected provisions of the bill.

H.R. 10, which was reported by the Committee on Public Works and Transportation without amendment, consists of two titles. Title I, the National Development Investment Act, authorizes and consolidates programs of the Economic Development Administration; \$530 million are authorized for each of fiscal years 1986, 1987, and 1988 for purposes of financing development projects in economically distressed areas in the United States and for the formulation of economic development plans for such areas.

Title II, the Appalachian Regional Development Act Amendments of 1985, authorizes \$723 million over 5 years for the nonhighway programs which are administered by the Appalachian Regional Commission in order to promote economic development in the severely distressed region which it serves. The bill also authorizes \$2 billion for fiscal years 1986 through 1992 to complete the Appalachian Highway System—a step which is considered crucial to the area's development. Should the House adopt the amendments to be offered en bloc by Chairman HOWARD, the total authorization levels in the bill will be reduced significantly for all programs included.

Both titles also include a variety of statutory modifications designed to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of the programs of the Economic Development Administration and the Appalachian Regional Commission. One example of such an amendment is a requirement that half of grant funds appropriated for EDA Administration be spent by the end of the seventh month of the fiscal year for which they were appropriated. The bill also requires that the Federal share of any

project of the ARC—with the exception of highway construction—may not exceed 50 percent.

The open rule now before the House, Mr. Speaker assures all Members the opportunity to offer germane amendments during the consideration of H.R. 10. I urge my colleagues to adopt the resolution so that we can begin to consider the important issues which are addressed in the bill.

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may use.

Mr. Speaker, the National Development Investment Act is an important bill. The rule has been ably explained, and I will not be redundant.

Mr. Speaker, we know that the administration wants to do away with the Appalachian Regional Commission and with the Economic Development Administration. I was on the Public Works Committee and helped draft the legislation to create the Appalachian Regional Commission. It has done a great job for the Appalachian area. I live in the heart of it. The Appalachian Regional Commission has opened up access to that area, bringing on economic development, and it has served a good purpose.

I would urge the Members of this House to consider seriously the continuation of these two programs as outlined by the Committee on Public Works and Transportation. I think it is a fine thing that we do this. Obviously the funds have been reduced. But the bill brings back into focus the original purpose of the Appalachian Regional Commission and the Economic Development Administration. It does what it should do, and that is to create jobs and construction, and the money is not wasted.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLINGER].

Mr. CLINGER. Mr. Speaker, this is a good rule. I would point out that the bill that we will be bringing to the floor under this rule contains a committee amendment which would make the authorization in this bill consistent with the House budget resolution.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, the amendment that we will bring exceeds anything that we have done yet in terms of a freeze, because the House budget resolution would call for a 10-percent cut in these programs, so what we are doing here is really a freeze, plus a 10-percent cut. So that, I think, would bring us, and does bring us, into line with the House budget resolution.

Mr. Speaker, this bill constitutes a significant reform of the legislation we have had in the past under the Economic Development Administration and the Appalachian Regional Commission. Criticisms were made last week of the fact that vast amounts of the country were eligible for aid under the EDA legislation, up to 80 percent. This bill would substantially correct

that abuse, and clearly it is an abuse. This would limit eligibility. It would bring the eligible areas down to those that are really most needful, the ones that are hurting the most, the ones that need some minimal investment at the Federal level in order to get their economic house in order and to begin to create the jobs that are necessary in those pockets of poverty throughout our country. So eligibility is limited under this bill.

The second thing this does is it addresses another criticism that was made of the bill, which was that the loan program was out of control, that we had vast numbers of loans that were in default or about to go into default. In essence, we recognize that criticism, and we have restructured the program so that the loan program that would be in existence would be strictly administered at the local level. They are in a much better position to monitor these loans and determine who should be receiving help and who should not, and then monitoring and making sure that the loans are kept current. So we have reformed that element of the bill.

□ 1730

We do accentuate planning and I would point out that it is because of the EDA that we have in place throughout this country planning people who are able and they are in place to help, particularly in our rural areas, to help them come up with and devise economic strategies for their areas. These people are very creative. They are knowledgeable. The expertise is there and we would continue that kind of support.

Last week, Mr. Speaker, we had voted on this issue, on the issue of EDA, and the vote was 318 against an amendment to delete all funding for EDA and 95 votes in favor. I think that demonstrated broad-based support for this legislation.

We also heard a number of success stories of things that have been accomplished through this agency, success stories that bespeak, I think, the fact that this has been an effective agency. It has created jobs. It has preserved jobs that otherwise would have disappeared and it has done so with a very, very modest investment of Federal dollars.

This is not a huge boondoggle, a huge pork-barrel program. It is a very targeted program and it will be even more targeted in the future.

Mr. Speaker, I think this is a good bill that we are considering. It is a much tighter bill. It is a targeted bill. It is a focused program. It is going to be built on the success stories that we have had in the past, while eliminating those areas and programs that have not proven effective.

It recognizes, Mr. Speaker, that there is a continuing role for the Federal Government, albeit a modest one, in the economic development problems of this country.

Again, it is a good rule and I urge support of the Members for it.

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of the rule so that the House can get down to business and pass the legislation when it is brought to the floor.

Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. BEILENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the rule.

Mr. Speaker, I have no further request for time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 406, nays 12, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 255]

YEAS—406

Ackerman	Bryant	Dingell
Addabbo	Burton (CA)	DioGuardi
Akaka	Burton (IN)	Dixon
Alexander	Bustamante	Donnelly
Anderson	Byron	Dorgan (ND)
Andrews	Callahan	Dornan (CA)
Annuzio	Campbell	Dowdy
Anthony	Carper	Duncan
Applegate	Carr	Durbin
Archer	Chandler	Dwyer
Aspin	Chappell	Dymally
Atkins	Chapple	Dyson
AuCoin	Cheney	Early
Barnard	Clay	Eckart (OH)
Barnes	Clinger	Eckert (NY)
Bateman	Coats	Edgar
Bates	Coble	Edwards (CA)
Bedell	Coelho	Edwards (OK)
Beilenson	Coleman (MO)	Emerson
Bennett	Coleman (TX)	English
Bentley	Collins	Erdreich
Bereuter	Combest	Evans (IA)
Berman	Conte	Evans (IL)
Bevill	Conyers	Fascell
Biaggi	Cooper	Fawell
Bilirakis	Coughlin	Fazio
Bliley	Courter	Feighan
Boehlert	Coyne	Fiedler
Boggs	Craig	Fields
Boner (TN)	Crane	Fish
Bonker	Crockett	Flippo
Borski	Daniel	Florio
Bosco	Dannemeyer	Foglietta
Boucher	Darden	Foley
Boulter	Daschle	Ford (MI)
Boxer	Daub	Ford (TN)
Breaux	Davis	Fowler
Brooks	de la Garza	Frank
Broomfield	DeLay	Franklin
Brown (CA)	Dellums	Frost
Brown (CO)	Derrick	Fuqua
Broyhill	Dickinson	Gallo
Bruce	Dicks	Garcia

Gaydos	Markey	Savage
Gekas	Marlenee	Saxton
Gephardt	Martin (IL)	Schaefer
Gibbons	Martin (NY)	Scheuer
Gilman	Martinez	Schneider
Gingrich	Matsui	Schroeder
Glickman	Mavroules	Schuetz
Gonzalez	Mazzoli	Schulze
Goodling	McCaig	Schumer
Gordon	McCandless	Seiberling
Gradison	McCloskey	Sensenbrenner
Gray (IL)	McCollum	Sharp
Gray (PA)	McCurdy	Shaw
Green	McDade	Shelby
Gregg	McEwen	Shuster
Grothberg	McGrath	Sikorski
Guarini	McHugh	Siljander
Gunderson	McKernan	Sisisky
Hall (OH)	McKinney	Skeen
Hall, Ralph	McMillan	Skelton
Hamilton	Meyers	Slattery
Hammerschmidt	Mica	Slaughter
Hansen	Michel	Smith (FL)
Hartnett	Mikulski	Smith (IA)
Hatcher	Miller (CA)	Smith (NE)
Hawkins	Miller (WA)	Smith (NH)
Hayes	Mineta	Smith (NJ)
Heftel	Mitchell	Smith, Robert
Hendon	Moakley	Snowe
Henry	Mollinari	Snyder
Hertel	Mollohan	Solomon
Hiller	Moody	Spence
Hillis	Moore	Spratt
Hopkins	Moorhead	St Germain
Horton	Morrison (CT)	Staggers
Howard	Morrison (WA)	Stallings
Hoyer	Mrazek	Stangeland
Hubbard	Murphy	Stark
Huckaby	Murtha	Stenholm
Hughes	Myers	Stokes
Hutto	Natcher	Strang
Hyde	Neal	Stratton
Ireland	Nelson	Sundquist
Jacobs	Nichols	Sweeney
Jeffords	Nielson	Swift
Jenkins	Nowak	Swindall
Johnson	O'Brien	Synar
Jones (NC)	Oaker	Tallon
Jones (OK)	Oberstar	Tauke
Jones (TN)	Obey	Tauzin
Kanjorski	Olin	Taylor
Kaptur	Ortiz	Thomas (CA)
Kasich	Owens	Thomas (GA)
Kastenmeier	Oxley	Torres
Kemp	Packard	Torricelli
Kennelly	Panetta	Towns
Kildee	Parris	Trafficant
Kindness	Pashayan	Traxler
Kiecicka	Pease	Udall
Kolbe	Penny	Valentine
Kolter	Pepper	Vander Jagt
Kostmayer	Perkins	Vento
Kramer	Petri	Visclosky
LaFalce	Pickle	Volkmer
Lagomarsino	Porter	Walgren
Lantos	Price	Walker
Latta	Pursell	Watkins
Leach (IA)	Quillen	Waxman
Leath (TX)	Rahall	Weaver
Lehman (CA)	Rangel	Weiss
Lehman (FL)	Ray	Wheat
Leland	Regula	Whitehurst
Lent	Reid	Whitley
Levin (MI)	Richardson	Whittaker
Levine (CA)	Ridge	Whitten
Lewis (CA)	Rinaldo	Williams
Lewis (FL)	Ritter	Wilson
Lightfoot	Roberts	Wirth
Lipinski	Robinson	Wise
Livingston	Rodino	Wolf
Lloyd	Roe	Wolpe
Loeffler	Roemer	Wortley
Long	Rogers	Wright
Lott	Rose	Wyden
Lowery (CA)	Rostenkowski	Wylie
Lowry (WA)	Roth	Yates
Lujan	Roukema	Yatron
Luken	Rowland (CT)	Young (AK)
Lundine	Rowland (GA)	Young (FL)
Mack	Roybal	Young (MO)
MacKay	Rudd	Zschau
Madigan	Russo	
Manton	Sabo	

NAYS—12

Armey	DeWine	Smith, Denny
Bartlett	Dreier	Stump
Barton	Frenzel	Vucanovich
Cobey	Hunter	Weber

NOT VOTING—15

Badham	Gejdenson	Monson
Boland	Hefner	Montgomery
Bonior (MI)	Holt	Shumway
Carney	Lungren	Solarz
Downey	Miller (OH)	Studds

□ 1750

Messrs. STUMP, HUNTER, and ARMEY changed their votes from "yea" to "nay."

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.J. RES. 187, APPROVING "COMPACT OF FREE ASSOCIATION"

Mr. PEPPER, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 99-224) on the resolution (H. Res. 235) providing for the consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 187) to approve the "Compact of Free Association," and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

NATIONAL DISABILITY IN ENTERTAINMENT WEEK

Mr. GARCIA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service be discharged from further consideration of the Senate joint resolution (S.J. Res. 86) to designate the week of July 25, 1985 through July 31, 1985, as "National Disability in Entertainment Week," and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I do not object, but I simply would like to inform the House that the minority has no objection to the legislation now being considered.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate joint resolution as follows:

S.J. Res. 86

Whereas the thirty six million people with disabilities in our Nation still face attitudinal barriers that prevent the full exercise of their civil liberties;

Whereas the entertainment industry is a powerful educational tool that has a significant impact on the images the Nation perceives;

Whereas the entertainment industry has been making strides in increasing both the quantity and quality of the portrayals and employment of people with disabilities in the media;

Whereas the continued involvement of the entertainment industry is vital to changing the stereotypes of people with disabilities;

Whereas the entertainment industry, the Federal Government, and the Nation should recognize the great potential for contribution from those with disabilities: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the week of July 25, 1985, through July 31, 1985, is designated as "National Disability in Entertainment Week" and the President is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation calling upon the people of the United States to observe the week with appropriate programs, ceremonies, and activities.

The Senate joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LUPUS AWARENESS WEEK

Mr. GARCIA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service be discharged from further consideration of the Senate joint resolution (S.J. Res. 57) to designate the week of October 20, 1985, through October 26, 1985, as "Lupus Awareness Week," and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker reserving the right to object, I do not object, but simply would like to inform the House that the minority has no objection to the legislation now being considered.

Mr. Speaker, under my reservation, I would like to yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN].

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to take this opportunity to express my strong support for Senate Joint Resolution 57, which designates October 20 through 26 as "Lupus Awareness Week." I would also like to thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BORSKI] for sponsoring the House companion measure, House Joint Resolution 197, which I am proud to have cosponsored.

It is appropriate that we consider this resolution today, while concerned people and members of lupus awareness organizations from across the United States are attending a Lupus Convention in Dallas, TX. The convention began on July 13 and will last until the 27th. Our consideration of

Senate Joint Resolution 57 will, I am certain, bolster the spirit and hope of all those in attendance who have dedicated their time and energy to this worthy cause.

The disease, lupus erythematosus, is an immunological disorder characterized by chronic inflammation of the connective tissues. Its symptoms include severe pain in the joints, and increased susceptibility to infections, rashes, and bruises. Sadly enough, these symptoms are worsened by exposure to sunlight, thus depriving lupus victims of the mental and sometimes physical healing power of the Sun. Although lupus is usually restricted to the extremities, it can also cause damage to major body organs, and in worst cases, lupus can even cause death.

Lupus erythematosus affects a staggering 50,000 people each year, but unfortunately is less understood than multiple sclerosis, muscular dystrophy, and cystic fibrosis, which claim less victims per year. Although these three diseases are less widespread than lupus, they are no less tragic. All four diseases, including lupus, are presently incurable. However, with lupus the problem of not having a cure is compounded by a significant lack of awareness. Although lupus erythematosus is not a rare condition, doctors who are unfamiliar with the disease often misdiagnose lupus victims who could have been effectively treated to reduce the severity of the condition.

Through the work of the Lupus Foundation of America, Inc., its constituent chapters and other concerned individuals, much progress has been made to support lupus victims and their families, to encourage funding for research and to increase awareness of lupus. In specific, I am familiar with the work of the Rockland and Orange Chapter of the Lupus Foundation of America, Inc., an all-volunteer health organization dedicated to lupus and located in my congressional district.

In spite of the progress that has already been made to increase the awareness of lupus erythematosus, there is still much work that needs to be done to educate the public, the Government, and most especially those in the medical profession about the incidence of lupus. Accordingly, I urge my colleagues to join in support of this measure. By passing Senate Joint Resolution 57, we can add to the progress that has already been achieved by organizations and people such as those currently gathered in Dallas at the Lupus Convention by giving them something to build upon, talk about, and hope for.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to fully support the measure.

● Mr. BORSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of Senate Joint Resolution 57, which designates the week of October 20-26, 1985, as "Lupus Awareness Week." I am proud to have sponsored this resolution, and would like to express my thanks to the many Members who joined me as cosponsors.

Lupus erythematosus, or lupus, is a debilitating disease of the body's immune system, and there is no cure yet known for it. The body's immune system attacks healthy tissue, resulting in severe inflammation and scarring. Lupus may only affect the skin in some victims, while in others it may damage major body organs. Lupus can cause kidney and heart disease, pleurisy, and pneumonia. In some cases, the disease may result in death.

Lupus affects over 500,000 Americans, with more than 50,000 new cases diagnosed yearly. While the disease can affect people of all ages, over 70 percent of its victims are women, often in their child-bearing years.

Lupus is largely unknown among the general public, even though it is more common than multiple sclerosis, muscular dystrophy, and leukemia. Further, it is often misdiagnosed, preventing victims from receiving the treatments that could possibly reduce the severity of the disease.

For these reasons, it is critical to increase the awareness of the general public to the symptoms, diagnosis, and possible prevention of lupus. "Lupus Awareness Week" is an important part of the effort to increase public awareness and promote early diagnosis and improved treatment.

I want to thank the Lupus Foundation of America for their leadership in bringing this issue to the attention of Congress. The Lupus Foundation is aggressively leading the fight to combat and ultimately defeat this illness.

It is my hope that this resolution can mark a unification of our concern and our efforts, on the part of Congress, the Lupus Foundation, and the general public, to finding an end to one of the most baffling, painful and injurious diseases now confronting the American public. Lupus Awareness Week is a heartening step in the right direction.●

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate joint resolution, as follows:

S.J. RES. 57

Whereas Lupus Erythematosus is a disease of unknown cause that affects over five-hundred thousand people in the United States, 90 percent of whom are women in their childbearing years;

Whereas Lupus Erythematosus, though not a rare disease, is unfamiliar even to some physicians which may result in the

disease being misdiagnosed or diagnosed too late;

Whereas Lupus Erythematosus in the most severe form can be fatal;

Whereas The Lupus Foundation of America, Inc., its constituent chapters, and other voluntary health organizations are established throughout the United States to serve and support victims of lupus and their families, encourage funding for research and increase public awareness; and

Whereas the public and the Federal Government are not sufficiently aware of the incidence of Lupus Erythematosus: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the week of October 20, 1985, through October 26, 1985, is designated as "Lupus Awareness Week" and the President is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation calling upon the people of the United States to observe the week with appropriate programs, ceremonies, and activities.

The Senate joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RECOGNIZING BOTH PEACE CORPS VOLUNTEERS AND THE PEACE CORPS ON THE AGENCY'S 25TH ANNIVERSARY

Mr. GARCIA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service be discharged from further consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 305) to recognize both Peace Corps volunteers and the Peace Corps on the Agency's 25th anniversary, 1985-86, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I do not object but simply would like to inform the House that the minority has no objection to the legislation now being considered.

Mr. Speaker, under my reservation, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. PAUL HENRY], who is the chief sponsor of House Joint Resolution 305.

Mr. HENRY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I simply point out, Mr. Speaker, that this resolution is a resolution of commendation for roughly 120,000 volunteers who have served in the Peace Corps in its 25-year history in over 90 countries across the world.

There were five former volunteers who presently serve in this body who joined in cosponsoring this resolution of tribute. I thank the gentleman from New York [Mr. GARCIA] for the speedy consideration of the resolution.

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, under my reservation, I would yield to the

gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN].

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to encourage my colleagues to support House Joint Resolution 305, legislation honoring the 25th anniversary of the Peace Corps. As a cosponsor of this resolution, I commend the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HENRY] for introducing this commemorative legislation in the House. It is especially appropriate that the gentleman from Michigan brings this bill before us, since it was in a speech given at the University of Michigan by the then-Presidential candidate, John F. Kennedy, that the concept and dream of a Peace Corps was first introduced.

President Kennedy's dream was realized when the Peace Corps was established by the Peace Corps Act of 1961. The Peace Corps was later made an independent agency by title VI of the International Security and Development Cooperation Act of 1981.

The corps has experienced tremendous growth since its inception. The number of volunteers serving in the Peace Corps has grown from the meager 864 that served in the first year of operation to more than 5,000 volunteers today. Our Peace Corps volunteers range in age from 21 to 83 years, serving in 60 countries throughout Africa, Latin America, Asia, the Near East, and the Pacific. More than 120,000 Americans have volunteered during the 25 years of the Peace Corps' existence.

Peace Corps volunteers are trained for a 9-to-14-week period in the appropriate local language, the technical skills necessary for their particular job, and the cross-cultural knowledge needed to adjust to a society with customs and attitudes different from their own. These volunteers serve usually for a period of 2 years, working primarily in the areas of agriculture, rural development, health, and education, while living among the people with whom they work. These are 24-hour jobs that have generated the well-deserved Peace Corps slogan "It's the toughest job you'll ever love."

This important work is made possible solely through the efforts of the Peace Corps volunteers. Let us celebrate the 25th anniversary of the Peace Corps by recognizing this demonstrated caring and desire of the American people to help others help themselves.

The year-long celebration of the 25th anniversary of the Peace Corps will begin with a symposium on October 21, 1985, at the University of Michigan. The theme of this symposium, and the many other symposiums scheduled throughout the year is "The U.S. Stake in the Developing World."

Accordingly, I urge my colleagues to join us in supporting House Joint Res-

olution 305 to honor the Peace Corps. It is vitally important that we show appreciation of the tremendous contributions made to developing countries by the thousands of Peace Corps volunteers by adopting this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Utah.

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

H.J. RES. 305

Whereas the United States Peace Corps is beginning its twenty-fifth year of providing volunteers to serve in countries of the developing world in helping people help themselves in their reach for a better life;

Whereas over one hundred and twenty thousand Americans have served in the Peace Corps in over ninety countries around the world in programs that have significantly added to bridges of understanding between the people of the United States and the peoples of the countries it has been privileged to serve;

Whereas Peace Corps volunteers have returned to their communities enriched by the experience, more knowledgeable of the world and the challenges of building a lasting peace;

Whereas Peace Corps volunteers continue to maintain open channels of communication with their friends in the country where they served, thereby continuing to build solid commitments of understanding; and

Whereas the response of Americans to Peace Corps' call for service in seeking long-term solutions to the complex human problems of hunger, poverty, illiteracy, and disease continue to exceed its recruitment requirements: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the period October 1, 1985, through September 30, 1986, shall be the official time set aside to reflect on the achievements of the Peace Corps during its twenty-five years, as well as to consider innovative ways that the talents and expertise of its volunteers and other bilateral volunteer programs might be used in the future; the President is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation setting forth October 1, 1985, through September 30, 1986, as a period of time to honor Peace Corps volunteers past and present, and reaffirm our Nation's commitment to helping people in the developing world help themselves.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 1800

MULE APPRECIATION DAY

Mr. GARCIA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service be discharged from further consideration of the joint resolution (H.R. Res.

76) to designate October 26, 1985, as "Mule Appreciation Day", and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I do not object, but simply would like to inform the House that the minority has no objection to the legislation now being considered.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

H.J. Res. 76

Whereas on October 26, 1785, the father of our country, George Washington, received the first jacks from King Charles III of Spain to breed the first American mules;

Whereas mules bred from these jacks began a tradition of service to our Nation in agriculture, mining, transportation, territorial exploration, war, and countless other endeavors;

Whereas mules have been such an important part in the building of this country; and

Whereas this is the bicentennial anniversary of the arrival of the first mules in America: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That October 26, 1985, is hereby designated as "Mule Appreciation Day". The President of the United States is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation calling upon the people of the United States to recognize October 26, 1985, as "Mule Appreciation Day".

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GARCIA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the joint resolutions just passed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 2817

Mr. EVANS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have my name withdrawn as a cosponsor of H.R. 2817.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

TEXT OF PROPOSED AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND THE PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA CONCERNING PEACEFUL USES OF NUCLEAR ENERGY—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 99-86)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, without objection, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed:

(For message, see proceedings of the Senate of today, Wednesday, July 24, 1985.)

CITY DEMONSTRATES NEED FOR FLOOD CONTROL PROJECT

(Mr. BOULTER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BOULTER. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the citizens of Wichita Falls, TX, overwhelmingly demonstrated their support for the Lake Wichita-Holliday Creek Flood Control Project. Not only did they demonstrate their support, but they also demonstrated true financial commitment. Yesterday the citizens voted to issue municipal bonds to fund a do it yourself flood control plan in the amount of \$9 million. Mr. Speaker, for over 40 years Wichita Falls has been plagued by severe flooding and the bureaucratic Federal Government has failed to provide any assistance. Even though last week's House passage of the 1986 appropriations for water projects brings funding closer, the citizens of Wichita Falls are tired of waiting. They have said enough is enough, and are going ahead with a city financed plan that will provide some, though not all, of the protection they need.

I commend the citizens for their initiative. Wichita Falls has shown both the community spirit to get things done and the necessary commitment to justify their request for Federal assistance to complete this project. With Federal funding to complement the city's input, the citizens will be protected to the level of a 100-year-flood. This will enable the city to continue to grow and prosper, thus creating jobs and economic opportunity. I urge my colleagues to act swiftly on legislation to make this project a reality.

THE UNANIMOUS DECLARATION OF DEPENDENCE ON MARINE RESOURCES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. ALEXANDER] is recognized for 5 minutes.

● Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, when this Nation declared its independence in 1776, we did so with a complete faith in the greatness of the American spirit and the ingenuity of the American mind. As the needs of our Nation grew, so did demands on our resources.

Today we find many of those traditional resources near depletion. In the last century man consumed half the Earth's fossil fuels. The remainder will be gone within the next 50 years. Almost half of the world's population is malnourished, while the specter of increased famine and disease looms perilously in the paths of developing nations in Africa, South America, and Asia. After only two centuries of existence, our society finds itself menaced by the pollution of our soil, rivers, forests, and air. We are threatened by the depletion of our mines, ground waters, and natural resources.

The message is clear. America must once again call on the genius of its sons and daughters, the spirit of its people, and set out once again to affirm its independence and preserve for future generations the freedoms that we have come to enjoy.

Mr. Speaker, recently I had the opportunity to speak at the dedication of the new education and research center of the Marine Resources Development Foundation. This nonprofit foundation was established in 1970 by the distinguished Ian Koblick, known to many as "The American Cousteau." Ian has overseen the work of the foundation for the past 15 years in its efforts to foster prudent development of the vast resources of the world's oceans.

To increase public awareness of the oceanic development, Ian Koblick has proposed an international "Declaration of Dependence," affirming the commitment of the world's business leaders, scientists, political leaders, and others to exploring new horizons in marine development and research.

I include a copy of this "Declaration of Dependence" in the RECORD, and encourage my colleagues to study its contents. It espouses important principles for our future, and points our Nation in a direction we must follow—for our own survival and our future independence.

DECLARATION OF DEPENDENCE

In 1776 independence from colonial rule was a matter of survival. Two centuries later we are faced with a new and more powerful adversary. Today survival has become a fight against resource depletion, over consumption, waste and pollution. Since the turn of this century, land resources (soil, forests, mines, lakes and rivers) have been diminished or depleted at an ever increasing rate. In 50 years the world's land resources will not support its spiraling population. We have reached that point in time and growth where we must think and plan for new sources of tomorrow's food, fresh water, energy and minerals.

To this end Marine Resources Development Foundation has established an education and research center in Key Largo, Florida. The nonprofit Foundation was established in 1970 by Ian G. Koblick, ocean pioneer and leading authority on "Living and Working in the Sea," which is the title of his recently published definitive work on underwater habitats and their meaning to man's survival.

An abundance of indisputable facts and predictable trends substantiate the population versus resources crisis. We are past the time for derisive gloom and doom comments, past the time of inaction. We can no longer afford to wait and watch, and work only when resource development is profitable. To break away from the restrictions of apathy, ignorance, and funding, creative ideas and strong motivating influences are needed now.

As a step in this direction the Marine Resources Development Foundation has prepared a special document entitled the Declaration of Dependence. This document patterned after the Declaration of Independence is an attempt to mobilize the support of leading marine scientists and citizens of influence.

The oceans which cover 71 percent of our planet have all the resources needed to adequately sustain a growing population. We must formulate plans now, as a national priority, to tap this abundant marine resource.

IN CONGRESS, JULY 24, 1985

THE UNANIMOUS DECLARATION OF DEPENDENCE ON MARINE RESOURCES

When in the course of human events it becomes necessary, for the survival of man and his planet, to arouse a common awareness of impending disasters, to spread knowledge of the overconsumption and abuse of the Earth's resources, it is time for man to recognize his communion with Nature and that which Nature's God entitles him, and to act forthrightly to replenish, maintain and enhance a wholesome environment.

We hold these truths to be conspicuously evident that all men are created with equal and inalienable rights and among these are the right of fresh air, clean water and the sustenance of life from land and water resources. These are the basic elements of man's Dependence on Earth for survival. When man knowingly, inadvertently, ignorantly or fortuitously transgresses this Dependence he acts against all mankind and Nature.

To secure man's vital rights and to abolish hunger, malnutrition and reckless and wanton pollution of our land, water and sky we must be aware of the imminent problems and disasters and muster strong defenses and concerted aggressions against all that threatens to restrict or destroy life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness.

This Declaration of Dependence, of ecological dependence, advances the proposition that all men of good conscience should actively promote the engendering of a high priority national affirmation and effort to inventory resources, evaluate resource utilization and develop programs that will provide what is essential to nurture mankind now and in the future.

In the absence of thorough scientific evidence, we accept the probabilities and implications presented in generalized reports and observations indicating that almost half the world's population is undernourished, that statistical projections indicate that the world's population may double in fifty years, that all the arable land on Earth

cannot feed all the people, under present conditions, for more than twenty-five to thirty years.

Furthermore, we are losing six billion tons of topsoil each year. The world's largest minority group, the hungry, the malnourished, grows by approximately one million people each week. The march, which could become a stampede, from areas of hunger to those of affluence has already begun, as evidenced by Central America's northern migrations and the plight of East Africans. China's population has reached the billion mark. Man has consumed half the world's supply of fossil fuels in the last century. The rest will be gone in fifty years. Wanton exploitation has destroyed or diminished ecological system and food chains that were thousands of years in developing. We have annihilated many species and subspecies and weakened others without ever knowing their ecological significance to natural harmony.

Population and irrigation demands have put the world on the edge of water bankruptcy. Eighty percent of man's illnesses can be attributed to impure or inadequate water supplies and this condition is aggravated by an increasing spread of acid rain, ground and water pollution from toxic chemicals and industrial wastes affecting all life on Earth.

As a nation, in 30 years, we have spent vast amounts of money on our space program. With all of its accomplishments, it has not yielded a single bite of food, a single drop of water, or a single watt of energy. However, the new technology developed through space exploration can have direct application to marine resource development.

We, here, in unanimity, declare what must be done. We must develop the world's resources, most importantly, Marine Resources. The oceans cover seventy-one percent of our planet and represent a nearly inexhaustible supply of food, fresh water, energy and minerals.

We are beyond theory. We have the skill and tools at hand to develop efficient processes of desalination to produce fresh water; aquaculture techniques to produce high protein feed and food with genetically engineered micro-algae using only sea water and sunlight; conversion methods to produce limitless energy from ocean tides, currents and thermal changes, and to extract hydrogen for a combustion based economy; extraction techniques to produce minerals and medicines from ocean water rich in pharmaceutically active compounds.

We are on the verge of breathing oxygen under water without cumbersome tanks and equipment. Man will know and feel a new freedom of exploration. Greater numbers of people will visit the depth of our oceans and investigate their wonders. Underwater habitats for research and recreation are becoming a reality. We have a sizeable population of marine scientists working on a broad array of projects that could bring to Earth the fruits of the Ocean.

Lacking is national organization, communications, prioritizing programs, and essential government, public and private sector recognition and support.

We, therefore, the representatives of the Congress of Marine Resources, appeal to the Governors and the governed to remove the blindfolds and restrictions imposed by apathy, affluence, disinterest and ignorance which result in a lack of vision and voice to see and decry insufficiency of action and coordination of effort.

Viable, nationally coordinated programs are needed now to alter the course of im-

pending events. We, in Congress, assert the urgent need to establish a national policy for marine resources development which will have the force and financing to achieve attainable objectives. We concur on setting as a specific goal, to be reached with in 25 years, the abolition of hunger on Earth, and within an economically feasible and scientifically possible framework.

We must return to all men their inalienable right to sustenance from their planet's resources. ●

LET CITIZENS HELP RETIRE THE DEBT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GROTHBERG] is recognized for 5 minutes.

● Mr. GROTHBERG. Mr. Speaker, how often have we heard the two little words, budget deficit, spoken in this Chamber? Those two little words describe something we all know is far from small. We are always looking for painless ways to reduce a deficit which could conceivably be the most destructive force in our children's and grandchildren's future. Today, I'm introducing a bill which in a small way gives all citizens a chance to take part in deficit slashing while Congress goes through the painful, but necessary, exercise of program reductions.

My bill would allow a taxpayer to designate at the time a tax return is filed that any portion over \$1 of an overpayment be used to reduce the public debt of the United States. The Secretary of the Treasury would be instructed to transfer the designated funds to a special account, which already exists, to reduce the debt. It adds no new layer of bureaucracy. Many of my constituents don't believe they pay enough taxes. This allows those individuals a chance to voluntarily contribute an extra amount.

I don't presume to believe that this bill will solve our deficit problem, but I think this legislation would afford our constituents an opportunity to be a part of the process and the ongoing solution. I urge my colleagues to support this idea. ●

THE RECIPROCAL TRADE AND ADJUSTMENT ACT OF 1985

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. McDADE] is recognized for 5 minutes.

● Mr. McDADE. Mr. Speaker, I am today reintroducing legislation to toughen the U.S. response to unfair trade practices by foreign competitors. This legislation, that I introduced in the 98th Congress as H.R. 1974, is known as "The Reciprocal Trade and Investment Act of 1985." The need for enactment of this bill is even greater today.

The American people have become all too familiar with what American

businessmen have long known—that our foreign competitors are not abiding by the rules that must exist to govern free trade.

Free trade must be fair trade.

The bill expands the list of actions that are defined as unfair trade practices under U.S. law. It also gives the President new powers to retaliate against unfair trade practices that hurt American products in all industries—from automobiles to agricultural exports as well as to the service industries.

In addition, this legislation is designed to counter foreign governmental subsidies for agriculture and other products which give them an unfair advantage over U.S. exports in overseas markets. This bill also focuses on trade practices of other nations that create barriers to prohibit or reduce the export of American service skills ranging from computer software to fast-food franchises.

Services related to computers, systems management, and data processing are and should continue to be an increasingly important part of the American export market.

Adoption of this act would authorize the President to place restrictions on any foreign investment and service contracts in our country, if necessary, to persuade other nations to hold these unfair trade practices. Under current law, the President can only retract previously granted trade concessions or imposed duties, fees or the restrictions on foreign imports. This bill would require the President to identify and access the impact on trade of foreign barriers and inform Congress of what will be done to eliminate those barriers. This legislation empowers Congress to request formal investigation and action in language which would strengthen section 301 of the Trade Act of 1974. This bill expands on legislation with similar provisions which passed the other body in the 97th Congress, but was not acted upon by this House of Representatives.

I urge my colleagues to join me in cosponsoring the Reciprocal Trade and Investment Act of 1985. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a digest of this legislation appear immediately after my statement in the RECORD.

THE RECIPROCAL TRADE AND ADJUSTMENT ACT OF 1985

Amends the Trade Act of 1974 to establish provisions dealing with foreign trade barriers. Directs the United States Trade Representative, (USTR), through the Interagency Trade Organization established pursuant to the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 to identify, analyze, and estimate the impact of practices that constitute significant barriers to or distortions of: (1) U.S. exports of goods and services; and (2) foreign direct investment by U.S. persons, especially if it has implications for trade in goods or services.

Set forth factors to be considered by the USTR in such analysis. Directs that the

USTR update the analysis annually. Requires the USTR to consider foreign subsidization of exports which are like or competitive with U.S. exports to be an act which constitutes a significant barrier to, or distortion of, U.S. export of goods. In addition, it directs the USTR to submit the analysis to the appropriate Congressional Committees and it requires the report to include any action taken to eliminate such trade barriers. Directs the USTR to consult with Congress on trade policies. Directs Federal agencies to furnish information and other assistance to prepare such analysis. Authorizes the President to respond to a foreign entity's unfair trade practices by taking action against any goods or sector of such entity without regard to whether the goods of sector were involved in the unfair trade practice. Authorizes the President to propose legislation to protect U.S. trade rights or to eliminate unfair trade practices. Requires such legislative proposals to be given priority treatment. Requires a summary of a petition for a trade investigation by the USTR to be published in the Federal Register, rather than the entire petition as in current law, if the USTR decides to begin an investigation with respect to the issues raised by the petition. Authorizes the USTR to initiate an investigation in order to advise the President concerning the exercise of the President's authority to take action against unfair trade practices. Directs the USTR to consult with the appropriate congressional committees before beginning such an investigation. Authorizes the USTR to delay for up to 90 days any request for consultation by a foreign entity concerning a petition for investigation into unfair trade practices. Directs the USTR to publish notice of the delay in the Federal Register and to report to Congress the reasons for the delay. Changes the definition of "commerce" for purposes of foreign trade investigations to include: (1) services associated with international trade, whether or not related to specific goods (currently products); and (2) foreign direct investment by U.S. persons with implications for trade in goods or services. Defines "unreasonable", "unjustifiable," and "discriminatory" for purposes of such investigations. Prohibits making information which the USTR has received in a trade investigation available to the public, if: (1) the person who provided the information makes a specified certification; (2) the USTR determines that such certification is well-founded; and (3) the person providing the information provides an adequate nonconfidential summary. Authorizes the USTR to use the information in trade investigations or to make it available to the public in a form which cannot identify the person providing the information. Sets forth the principal U.S. negotiating objectives with respect to trade in services, foreign direct investment, and high technology products. Directs the USTR to develop and coordinate the implementation of U.S. policies concerning trade in services. Requires Federal agencies responsible for regulating any service sector industry to advise and work with the USTR concerning: (1) the treatment afforded U.S. services sector interest in foreign markets; or (2) allegations of unfair practices by foreign governments or companies in a service sector. Authorizes the Secretary of Commerce to establish a service industries development program. Sets forth the goals of the program. Expresses the policy of the Congress that the President shall: (1) consult with State governments on trade policy issues affecting the regulatory au-

thority on non-Federal governments or their procurement of goods and services; and (2) establish one or more intergovernmental policy advisory committees on trade.

Authorizes the President to establish policy advisory committees representing non-Federal governmental interests to provide policy advice on trade negotiating objectives, bargaining positions, and the implementation of trade agreements. Authorizes the President to negotiate to reduce trade barriers in foreign direct investment by U.S. persons, especially if such investment has implications for trade in goods and services. Authorizes the President to enter into agreements concerning high technology industries. Requires the Department of Commerce to submit a report to Congress analyzing factors, not addressed by this Act, which significantly affect the competitiveness of U.S. high technology industries and which have a potential for high sales growth in world markets. Authorizes the President to proclaim the modification, elimination, or continuance of any existing duty, duty-free, or excise treatment, or any additional duties to carry out agreements concluded under this Act. Requires the President to exercise this authority only with respect to specified items listed in the U.S. Tariff Schedules. Provides for the termination of such authority within five years after the enactment of this Act.●

H.R. 8—THE WATER QUALITY RENEWAL ACT OF 1985

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. LANTOS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

● Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, when the House voted on H.R. 8, the Water Quality Renewal Act 1985, I was unavoidably detained while holding a hearing in my congressional district on the subject of Federal tax reform, and, therefore, I was unable to cast my vote on this important issue. I wish to be certain, however, that my consistent and enthusiastic support for this bill is known.

The Congress enacted the Clean Water Act in 1972 to reduce the pollution of our Nation's streams, rivers, and lakes by municipal sewage and industrial discharge. A great deal of progress has been achieved under that farsighted legislation. Despite significant increases in population and industrial discharges, we have seen important successes in reducing the pollution of our Nation's waters.

Since 1982, however, many of the specific programs and general authorizations of the original Clean Water Act have expired, and we have attempted to operate without a regular authorization. Passage of the Water Quality Renewal Act of 1985 is essential to close these gaps and to remove uncertainties in funding and delays in implementing essential programs to maintain and improve our water quality.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly oppose the amendment offered by Mr. STANGELAND of Minnesota which would allow

companies to opt for weaker, locally imposed limits on industrial pollutants. This amendment would drastically slow down compliance with clean-water standards, and it would undermine and defeat the purposes of the Clean Water Act.

Mr. Speaker, I also strongly oppose the amendment offered by Mr. PURSELL of Michigan to freeze funding for water quality programs at 1985 levels. The Public Works and Transportation Committee, as directed in the House budget resolution, has already made reductions of \$600 million in programs under its jurisdiction. The Water Quality Renewal Act is consistent with the House-passed budget resolution. The funding provided in this legislation is essential, and the funding reduction proposed by Mr. PURSELL would only further delay long-needed action to clean up our waters.

I welcome the passage of this act. Our Nation's waters are a precious natural heritage. This act is essential to insure that they are protected from further pollution and to remedy some of our failures in the past to take action such as this. ●

ONE HUNDRED AND EIGHTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF BIRTH OF CONSTANTINO BRUMIDI

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ANNUNZIO] is recognized for 5 minutes.

● Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, on Friday, July 26, 1985, we commemorate the 180th anniversary of the birth of Constantino Brumidi, that "Michelangelo of the Capitol," whose imperishable works of art add so greatly to the splendor and beauty of our Capitol.

It is appropriate that Congress once again recognize the contributions of the "Michelangelo of the Capitol" on this anniversary day. For the occasion, Cornelius W. Heine, Executive Director of the U.S. Capitol Historical Society, who has studied Brumidi art in the Capitol for 5 years, has written an article bringing into focus the art and the artist. I submit for the RECORD this article entitled "An Artist's Contribution to America."

AN ARTIST'S CONTRIBUTION TO AMERICA
(By Cornelius W. Heine, Executive Director,
U.S. Capitol Historical Society)

Holding fast to the last rung of a ladder on the scaffolding from which he had just fallen, Constantino Brumidi dangled precariously 80 feet above the Rotunda floor. Just before his strength ebbed, Captain Landman was able to secure ropes about him and lower the 75 year old artist gently to the floor below. It was October 1, 1879. That was the last time the aging artist was to apply his brush and paints to the walls of the Capitol. He continued to prepare sketches from which his assistant, Felippo Costaggini, executed the frescoes on the belt of the Rotunda. Brumidi, tired in spirit,

and strength, died four months later in 1880. For 25 years he had labored tirelessly throughout the Capitol completing a vast amount of lasting art—clearly the work of a master artist. Following his death, the memory and the recognition of Brumidi's immense contribution was lost sight of. Thanks to Mrs. Myrtle Cheney Murdock, wife of the congressman from Arizona, Brumidi's life and contributions were once again highlighted in 1948. Mrs. Murdock's research culminated in her magnificent book "Constantino Brumidi—The Michelangelo of the Capitol." Those many Americans, greatly interested in the art of the Capitol, are indebted to the work of Mrs. Murdock.

Brumidi's life is the story of the power of the meaning of America and of one man's attempt to portray its principles through art as his payment for the freedom he found. Seeking that freedom, Constantino Brumidi left his native Italy in 1852, leaving behind a land caught up in political turmoil. He landed in New York City on September 18, 1852, the anniversary of the date upon which President George Washington laid the cornerstone of the Capitol in 1793. Penniless and downtrodden, Brumidi did some art work in New York City and for a time in Mexico. In 1855 the artist came to Washington. At the Capitol, fate brought him into contact with Captain Montgomery Meigs, who was in charge of the construction and decoration of the great dome, and who was looking, vainly, for an artist skilled in fresco. This old world art form was the decorative treatment of large sections of ceilings and walls, wherein the painting was done on freshly laid plaster with the pigment suspended in pure water. The art then became a permanent part of the structure itself. When Meigs found that Brumidi was a fresco artist, he hired him. Before commencing his work, Brumidi wrote a prayer as his preface to an achievement that grows larger with each passing year. He said, "My one ambition and my daily prayer is that I may live long enough to make beautiful the Capitol of the one country on earth in which there is liberty."

Though conditions in Italy in the mid-nineteenth century induced Constantino Brumidi to come to America for a new life, it was, in another sense, in his native Italy wherein through long years of study, his skill as an artist was nurtured and sharpened. There at the *Accademia di San Luca*, he had studied under the greatest artists and sculptors of the time—Vincenzo Camuccini, Antonio Canova, and Berthel Thorwaldsen. It was there he executed outstanding artistic achievements, which were to be precursors to his later work in the Capitol. In his interior decoration of the Dome of the Church of the *Madonna dell Archetto*, Brumidi's art was acclaimed as approaching that of the great masters. But of most significance for the future of the United States Capitol, Brumidi was evolving concepts and techniques that he would later apply in his greatest works in the Capitol. The central figure in the Dome of the Church of the *Madonna dell Archetto* surrounded by angels is somewhat analogous to the later Eye of the Dome painting in the Capitol, depicting Washington surrounded by a circle of maidens representing the original thirteen states. Similarly, in the Capitol room where Brumidi strove to excel in every possible way—the President's Room, his four madonnas in the ceiling call to mind also his earlier adornment of the Church of the *Madonna dell Archetto*, with four madonnas on

the pilasters, representing the theological virtues.

So as with many other individuals who contributed to the greatness of America, our nation is indebted to the heritage and the culture which they brought with them from their native lands. In Brumidi's case it was the sensitive skill and ability to use great art to portray the principles upon which a new nation had been founded. Both the land of his heritage, Italy, and the United States of America—his chosen country, can be justly proud of Constantino Brumidi.

However, when Constantino Brumidi first arrived on the Capitol scene in 1855, he had little inkling of such monumental undertakings as the Eye of the Dome and the President's Room. Nor were the officials of the Capitol yet convinced of his technical skill. Thus, Captain Meigs and the leaders of Congress gave the newly arrived artist a chance to prove himself by undertaking the fresco decoration of the House Agriculture Committee Room (H-144). There he completed his first fresco and the first completed in the Capitol, as he depicted the Seasons of the Year. When the officials reviewed that work, they were greatly pleased. They marveled, as had the critics of Rome earlier, of the beautiful hues of colors and the harmony of the whole execution. Brumidi had passed the test and the way was now open for him to begin a quarter-century of art in the Capitol.

Not long thereafter, the Capitol officials contemplated the decoration of the canopy of the dome. Brumidi was commissioned to execute the decoration of this almost 5000 square feet canopy at a cost not to exceed \$40,000. The undertaking represented a tremendous challenge to even the most skilled fresco artist. But it was one to which Brumidi was equal. While Secretary of the Interior Usher, who was in charge of the Capitol in 1863, expressed concern that progress on the "Eye of the Dome" was too slow, once Brumidi had completed his cartoons and was ready to apply oils to the plaster, this mammoth work was finished in less than one year in 1864. The official title given to the work was "The Apotheosis of George Washington" and it represented the deification of the First President and the principles that he and the nation exemplified. In historical retrospect, few if any artists living at that time could have been better suited to bring life through art to the canopy of the great dome than Constantino Brumidi. He must have called upon all the techniques and skills learned over a quarter of a century before in his native Italy. First he had to have the ability to plan and envision the overall concept, to know exactly the size required, so that his 15 foot figures would appear life-like in size to the visitors eye 181 feet below. His mastery of fresco required the prior knowledge, almost in scientific exactitude of the colors and the varying shades as they would appear when finally dried. This was all the more difficult, in that the colors were originally applied on wet dark brown plaster, giving no hint, except to the Master skilled in "buono fresco," in how the shades would eventually turn out. The final Masterpiece was finished before the Second Inauguration of President Abraham Lincoln. Sometime prior to that time on the box in the grouping where Mercury, Protector of Travelers and Merchants, is advising Benjamin Franklin, Robert Fulton, and Samuel B. Morse, Brumidi affixed his signature and the date 1865.

Following his unexcelled achievement of the "Eye of the Dome" painting, Constan-

tino Brumidi moved to the Senate side, where he decorated the halls and corridors, which today bear the title "The Brumidi Corridors." There he was assisted by some 25 or more artisans. But it is believed that he personally executed the frescos in the ceilings and many of the animals and birds which adorn the walls.

Brumidi also applies his skills in many of the committee rooms in the Senate wing of the Capitol. In the room now used by the Vice President's staff is the beautiful fresco of "the South being welcomed back into the Union of the States." Nearby, in the much larger room—once the Senate District of Columbia Committee Room—and now the Senate Democratic Policy Committee Room, the walls and the ceilings are all exquisite Brumidi. Four major fresco paintings decorate each wall, beginning with "Physics" on the north wall and continuing clockwise with "Geography," "History" and lastly the "Telegraph." Groupings representing the Three Graces are found in each corner of the ceiling and the entire ceiling contains special decorative motifs of the artist Brumidi. In the three room suite now used by the Senate Appropriations Committee, Brumidi spent many arduous hours of workmanship, when these rooms were the Indian Affairs Committee Room and the Naval Affairs Committee Room. In the latter room, now used by the Senate Appropriations Committee, Brumidi used a theme symbolic of the sea and marine life. Figures from Greek and Roman mythology and a variety of half-human-half sea creatures adorn the room. Since the committee rooms are used for official legislative work, visitors rarely see the remarkable art treasures within them. In the case of the Senate Appropriations Committee Room, Committee Chairman, Mark Hatfield had the central door off the main corridor converted to open glass, so that visitors may look in and see the art of Brumidi and the room itself whenever the Committee is not in session.

Many art historians believe that the high point in Brumidi's Capitol odyssey came with his decoration of the President's Room. Perhaps, realizing this room would be used by Presidents of the United States down through the years, Brumidi exerted every effort to reach the near-perfection of his artistic ability. The art in the President's Room reveals not only Brumidi's mastery of form and harmony of colors, but his gifted technique of using light and shadow to convey a three-dimensional quality to the figures. Cherubs appear as if their arms are actually reaching out from the flat wall. Outstanding portraits of Benjamin Franklin, George Washington, William Brewster, and Americus Vesputius adorn the walls. As in his earlier work in the Rotunda, Brumidi sought to depict principles both underlying the founding of the new government and the work that would go on within the walls of the Capitol. Thus he achieved through the depiction of four beautifully executed Madonnas in the ceiling of the room. Holding symbols of the principle or virtue being depicted, the madonnas represent the Executive, for whom the room was designed; Religion, representing the higher moral values by which mankind is guided; Legislation, which is the official duty of the Congress, and Liberty, which was that principal of human dignity that brought people to a new land and caused them to create a government, based on that human dignity.

Of Brumidi's work in the Capitol, there seemed almost no end. He even designed ex-

quisite monumental bronze stairways—two each for the House and Senate, which were modeled and cast by other artisans and represent the highest art-form of bronze work found anywhere in the United States.

When Constantino Brumidi uttered his prayer that he be given time to beautify the Capitol, he perhaps had no number of years in mind. As his 25th year of his labor of love approached, age, the work of years, and personal hardships had taken their toll. By the late 1870's, he was back in the Rotunda to begin his last art work in the Capitol—the frieze bordering the base of the Dome and entitled "America in History." It was there, while working on the grouping of William Penn and the Indians, that Brumidi's fall occurred.

While art historians and critics continue to study the work of Brumidi, there appears to be a growing recognition of the mastery of his art. The amount of his art is almost baffling to the mind. He must have been absorbed in his art and followed the early Latin motto *Labore est Orare*—work is prayer.

The Capitol is a treasure house of art and particularly the treasure house of Brumidi's art. As we approach the 180th anniversary of the birth of Constantino Brumidi, his art is bringing more and more acclaim. After being forgotten for many years, he is now being referred to as the Michelangelo of the Capitol. Once his remaining paintings and work sketches of his original paintings in the Capitol as left to his son and later auctioned off, found little public interest. Today even his work sketches are prized by collectors. The work sketch of "The Telegraph" referred to earlier was acquired by the curator of the Senate at a cost of some \$27,000.

Increasing recognition has been given Brumidi by the Congress in recent years. Leading such recognition, Congressman Frank Annunzio introduced in 1966 a House Resolution to memorialize Brumidi with a marble bust and the late Senator Paul Douglas introduced a similar resolution in the Senate. These efforts were supported by the Honorable Peter Rodino and former Senator John O. Pastore. On April 30, 1968 the dedication of the bust of Constantino Brumidi by the sculptress Jimilu Mason took place in the Capitol Rotunda. That marble bust now rests on a pedestal across from the Senate Foreign Relations Committee Room and amid the corridors where Brumidi worked so ardently during his lifetime.

But while the art of Brumidi is now receiving the due it deserves, what of Brumidi the man. In one sense Constantino Brumidi cannot be separated from his art. His life was art and his obsession was to beautify a single building—the Capitol of the United States. He lived in an age where the care of family records and the interest in recording history was not what it is today. Perhaps, in the future historians will study further the man apart from his art. But for now the legacy of Constantino Brumidi is the vast array of fresco art in the Capitol of the United States. It is the nation's treasure created by one who poured out his love for America through his art. Here in the Capitol, all the years of apprenticeship under the masters and his own artistic work in the palaces and churches of Italy came to distillation in the majestic "Eye of the Dome" painting; in the President's Room; and in the halls and corridors of the Capitol.

Constantino Brumidi's family and descendants recognized his unique greatness

among artists. Lola Germond Brumidi, his wife and model for many of the figures in his Capitol paintings saw that he was buried in her family plot upon his death, even though circumstances had caused their parting earlier. Today, the great-grand niece of Lola Germond Brumidi, Mildred Thompson, helps to keep alive the memory and the contributions of Constantino Brumidi. Mrs. Thompson frequently shares insights into various aspects of Brumidi's work in the Capitol and elsewhere. She has pointed out that despite his massive production of art in the Capitol, Brumidi's works of art may also be seen in the frescoes in St. Aloysius Church on North Capitol Street in Washington, in St. Stephen's Church in New York City, and in the form of portrait paintings held in private collections. Recently, the U.S. Capitol Historical Society acquired the Brumidi portrait of Mrs. Edward Clark, wife of the Architect of the Capitol when Brumidi did his principal works, and donated it to the Capitol collection.

Many years ago President Herbert Hoover said: "... The Capitol is this national stage on which the drama of our political life is played. Here we fought the battles that tested the foundation of our government. We face similar problems of our time; and in centuries hence, some other Americans will face the great problems of their time. For our task and their tasks there is need of a daily inspiration of surroundings that suggest not only the traditions of the past, but the greatness of the future."

Constantino Brumidi spent a quarter century working to create "that daily inspiration of surroundings" of which President Hoover spoke. He strove through art to go beyond the "inspiration of surroundings" by symbolically depicting some of the fundamental principles underlying the founding of the United States—courage, freedom of the individual, justice, and faith that this nation, so conceived, would endure. Brumidi's legacy is the nation's legacy. Millions of visitors have passed through the Capitol and continue to do so. Some of these visitors and the lawmakers who serve within the Capitol, at times glance upwards upon the masterful art of one man, who wanted to repay the nation which gave him the freedom he yearned for. The verdict of history looks kindly, I believe, upon his repayment, as the Nation and the Congress of the United States pause to honor Constantino Brumidi on the 180th anniversary of his birth—July 26, 1885.●

REFORM OF THE HOUSE RULES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Kansas [Mrs. MEYERS] is recognized for 60 minutes.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who participate tonight may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks, and to submit extraneous and supportive material in conjunction with the special order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I rise to discuss a matter of

great concern to many Members of the House of Representatives, and that is reform of the rules by which we conduct the people's business.

As the chairman of the House Republican Task Force on Congressional Reform, my office has embarked on an exhaustive research project, identifying numerous instances and cases where House rules could and should be modified to allow a more democratic participation in the legislative decisionmaking process.

On July 11, I introduced House Resolution 220, which calls for the consideration of another House Resolution, No. 164, introduced previously by our distinguished minority leader [Mr. MICHEL].

I have today filed a petition to discharge the resolution from the Rules Committee.

While I am not unaware of partisan considerations which may affect consideration and discussion of this reform proposal, I truly believe that Members on both sides of the aisle can work together in a spirit of statesmanship toward a package of reforms which will benefit the entire House.

I am very willing to work with all of my colleagues in this worthwhile process of reexamining the rules by which we work together. I earnestly seek the support of Members of the majority who, while we may differ on other substantive issues, are willing to consider ways and means to make this body run more efficiently; be more sensitive, and responsive to the people and be more productive and effective in resolving the many important issues facing America today.

Before I proceed, Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield to my friend, the gentlewoman from Nevada [Mrs. VUCANOVICH].

Mrs. VUCANOVICH. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleague, Congresswoman MEYERS, for holding this special order so that we can discuss the problems certain Members have with the rules of this House. I would like to focus my remarks on committee ratios and proxy voting.

First, addressing the Democrat leadership's desire to hide behind the protection of strength through numbers—it seems that the Democrats don't play with a full deck even when they stack the deck.

Unfair committee ratios are an obvious attempt to squash reasonable and constitutional debate of important issues. The leadership of the House is simply protecting its private viewpoint from possible defectors who may have a different view.

By loading the committees with heavyhanded numbers of Democrats, Mr. O'NEILL, Mr. WRIGHT, and their lieutenants have made sure that the only viewpoint on an issue is their view!

How do you freethinking, intelligent Democrats feel knowing that your leadership has chosen its view and has planted it in every committee, no matter what you think? What happens to your voice if you differ from your leaders?

I call on every single colleague of mine, Republican and Democrat, to demand that TIP O'NEILL allow fair and equitable representation on all committees that reflect the true ratio of this body.

And to compound the attempted censorship of views of the loyal opposition in committees by the Democrat leadership, Mr. O'NEILL and company continue to define democracy as "four votes, one man"—better known as proxies.

Not only are minority viewpoints suppressed; they are voted down by Members who are not even there and there are ghosts who the leadership has claimed are vital to their committee. If they are so vital, Mr. Speaker, let's have them present in committee, voting their own position. We should not condone the practice of proxy voting passing legislation.

The American people are demanding we make important well-informed decisions on the floor and we can't even get the benefit of committee member's knowledge because they are not attending—they are voting by proxy.

By continuing this practice of absentee representation, the Democrat leadership has simply said to the American voter, "I will give you full representation on the floor of the House, but I don't have to in committee."

It seems the Democrats want to give the people only half of their voice in Congress.

□ 1810

I thank the gentlewoman for holding this special order, and I am glad to have been able to participate.

Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas. I thank my colleague for her remarks.

There is a view that Congress is unable to cope effectively with today's widespread problems. Such a view has been around for almost 40 years and probably existed before that. Congress responded with the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 and with it reformed committee jurisdictions. In the 1970's Congress took steps toward improving congressional capabilities and efficiency with which it meets its legislative, investigative, and oversight responsibilities. Of the number of actions taken in this direction, four stand out: The Legislative Reorganization Act of 1970, the Technology Assessment Act of 1972, the Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974, and the Committee Reform Amendments of 1974.

Many good things have been accomplished with the passage of these reforms, such as modifying floor voting

procedures to save time and announcing each year's anticipated schedule to enable Members to plan accordingly. Unfortunately, the Congress has done little else to improve its methods of operations since the 1970's. There remains much that needs to be accomplished.

Found in House Resolution 164 are a series of reform proposals that deserve the attention of Members on both sides of the aisle. Legislation I have introduced would bring House Resolution 164 to the floor for 10 hours of debate. Thoughtful discussion and input from all Members would provide great insight into ways that the rules could be improved.

I am one of the freshmen, one of the new kids on the block, and concede that I have more to learn about the House than others. However, as a freshman I have been frustrated by a number of things. Scheduling is a terrible problem for all of us. There are committee hearings to attend, constituents to meet, legislative issues and priorities to become familiar with, votes to cast, debates to both listen to and participate in, and on and on.

We need to organize the time of all Members so that we are better able to represent and serve our constituents. The task force which I chair is not the first to suggest such reforms. There has been a Commission on Administrative Review, another Task Force on Reform, the Commission on More Effective Government, and the Select Committee on Committees, to name a few. What we need to do is stop, listen, and learn from what these people were trying to tell us.

In 1979 a survey was done of both Republican and Democratic members of the Select Committee on Committees. I am submitting a copy of this survey for the RECORD.

SURVEY OF HOUSE MEMBERS

Because of the short time available to the Select Committee in which to complete its work, committee members sought a variety of means through which to evaluate Member opinion on various organization options. The Bolling Committee, in 1973, held extensive public hearings on committee reorganization. It was the feeling of the Select Committee that such generalized hearings could not be held in view of the committee's early reporting deadline.

The committee therefore sought alternative means to determine Member sentiment toward reorganization. In June and July, staff of the Select Committee interviewed more than forty Members of the House. The interviews were held off the record, but they provided valuable early input which served to shape future committee decisions. In October 1979, the staff of the Select Committee drafted two questionnaires on specific reorganization proposals. In all, more than two hundred House Members responded to the survey questionnaires. The text of the questionnaires, and the response totals are included in this section.

QUESTIONNAIRE 1.—COMBINED RESPONSES OF REPUBLICAN AND DEMOCRATIC MEMBERS SELECT COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES, NOV. 16, 1979

	Democrat			Republican			Combined		
	Yes	No	Undecided ¹	Yes	No	Undecided ¹	Yes	No	Undecided ¹
A. GENERAL									
1. Please indicate whether or not you agree with each of the following general statements about committee system revision:									
(a) The House committee system is in disarray and comprehensive revision of the system should be given high priority	82	28	12	46	11	5	128	39	17
(b) Despite appearances of disarray, the committee system is functioning about as well as can be expected and does not require major reorganization	25	85	12	13	44	3	38	129	15
(c) A carefully developed comprehensive revision of the committee system will attract wide support among Members	30	45	47	17	25	20	47	70	67
(d) Most Members would be more likely to accept a relatively few modest changes, rather than a comprehensive revision	85	13	24	47	8	7	132	21	31
(e) Committee system revision is so necessary that it should be pursued even if Members see themselves adversely affected by specific jurisdictional or other changes	85	22	15	46	10	6	131	32	21
(f) Committee system revision should be limited to changes which do not affect Members' positions or jurisdictions	16	93	13	7	50	5	23	143	18
Importance									
	High	Medium	Low	High	Medium	Low	High	Medium	Low
2. Following is a list of possible goals or objectives of committee system revision: Please indicate, for each, the level of importance you believe it should have.									
(a) Strengthen authority of committee chairmen	32	44	46	5	26	31	37	70	77
(b) Strengthen role of leadership	52	42	28	13	21	28	65	63	56
(c) Improve information resources	68	35	18	33	15	14	101	50	32
(d) Rationalize jurisdictions	97	17	8	57	3	2	154	20	10
(e) Strengthen oversight	84	32	6	50	9	3	134	41	9
(f) Reduce fragmentation	101	15	6	53	6	3	154	21	9
(g) Improve hearing process	52	45	25	20	26	16	72	71	41
(h) Reduce costs of committee operations	40	48	34	38	17	8	78	65	42
(i) Consolidate committee system by reducing number of units and assignments	79	28	15	42	14	6	121	42	21
(j) Control growth of committee staffs	69	36	17	43	14	5	112	50	22
(k) Develop means of cooperation between committees	84	31	7	39	18	5	123	49	12
B. COMMITTEE STRUCTURE AND ASSIGNMENTS									
1. Do you believe the number of subcommittees should be reduced?	98	9	15	51	8	3	149	17	18
If so, what should be the maximum number of subcommittees (except for Appropriations): 5 (71), 6 (47), 7 (8), 8 (7), other (40).									
2. Do you believe the total number of subcommittee assignments per Member should be limited?	95	7	20	57	3	2	152	10	22
If so, what should be the maximum number of subcommittee assignments per Member? 3 (48), 4 (66), 5 (23), 6 (6), other (38).									
C. COMMITTEE RULES AND PROCEDURES									
1. Under which conditions, if any, should committees be allowed to close their meetings to the public: Security.									
2. Should Members be authorized to take leaves of absence from assigned committees, without losing seniority, to serve temporarily on other committees?	68	37	17	26	24	12	94	61	29
3. Should proxy voting in committee be prohibited?	33	83	6	47	14	1	80	97	7
4. Should the quorum required for the transaction of business and the marking up of legislation be increased from one-third to one-half to correspond with the quorum required to report a measure?	42	66	14	46	12	4	88	78	18
D. COMMITTEE ADMINISTRATION, FUNDING, AND STAFFING									
1. Should committees be required to publish advance monthly calendars of future committee/subcommittee meetings and hearings?	73	32	17	41	14	7	114	46	24
2. Please indicate your agreement or disagreement with each of the following statements or proposals (which do not necessarily reflect the views of the Select Committee or its Members) regarding committee staff:									
(a) Committee staffs, generally, are too big	69	33	20	47	10	5	116	43	25
(b) So long as committee workloads increase, committee staffs should keep pace	51	47	24	20	31	11	71	78	35
(c) Large subcommittee staffs have contributed to the fragmentation and unmanageability of the House committee system	70	30	22	44	7	11	114	37	33
(d) Subcommittee independence is a positive factor in the committee system and thus requires independent staffing	55	44	23	18	33	11	73	77	34
(e) Staffing of subcommittees should be under the control of full committees rather than function independently	57	48	16	34	22	6	91	70	22
(f) Some kind of ceiling or cap should be imposed on committee/subcommittee staffs overall	89	19	14	59	2	1	148	21	15
(g) The number of subcommittees per committee on which, under the rules, chairmen and ranking minority members have independent authority to appoint 1 staff member should be reduced from 6 to 4	65	28	29	38	9	15	103	37	44
(h) Committee minorities should be entitled to appoint a full 1/2 share of committee/subcommittee staffs	52	42	28	59	1	2	111	43	30
(i) The expansion of Members' personal staffs has become a serious problem, too	42	64	16	24	32	6	66	96	22
E. OVERSIGHT									
1. In general, do you believe that House committees are doing an adequate job of oversight?	26	84	12	3	55	4	29	139	16
2. Currently, about 1/2 the standing committees centralize all or part of their oversight activities in oversight subcommittees; other committees decentralize oversight through their regular subcommittees. Which arrangement in your experience, produces more effective oversight?									
(a) A single oversight subcommittee	27	39	56	14	38	17	41	77	73
(b) Each subcommittee doing its own oversight	48	24	50	32	11	19	80	35	69
(c) A combination of (a) and (b)	45	24	53	18	16	28	63	40	91
3. The Government Operations Committee under the rules, is required to review and report biennially on the oversight plans of House committees in order to assure effective coordination of oversight.									
(a) Do you believe this requirement achieves the needed coordination?	14	64	44	5	47	10	19	111	54
(b) Should the Government Operations Committee's authority to coordinate oversight be strengthened?	47	38	37	25	22	15	72	60	52
(c) Should the committee's coordinating role be eliminated?	23	60	39	16	32	14	39	92	53
(d) Should this coordinating role be assigned to the Committee on House Administration (and its Accounts Subcommittee) in connection with its consideration of committee funding resolutions?	16	65	41	10	22	19	26	87	60
(e) Should the coordinating function be performed by the House leadership?	29	53	40	14	32	16	43	85	56
4. Should committees be required to do more systematic "foresight" work, analogous to oversight, in order to anticipate new and developing policy concerns?	90	9	23	46	8	8	136	17	31
5. Overall, are you satisfied that the legislative branch support agencies (Congressional Research Service, General Accounting Office, Congressional Budget Office, and Office of Technology Assessment) are adequately supporting the work of House committees?	88	17	17	45	13	4	133	30	21
6. If you have experienced committee oversight efforts which you believe were unsuccessful, which of the following factors, if any, were significantly responsible for lack of success:									
(a) Lack of commitment or determination on the part of the committee	71	13	38	41	3	19	112	16	57
(b) Partisan differences within the committee	24	57	41	22	23	17	46	80	58
(c) Inexperienced, untrained staff	29	52	41	13	29	20	42	81	61
(d) Too few staff	12	65	45	4	40	18	16	105	63
(e) Inadequate support from GAO, CRS, OTA, or CBO	10	3	4	2	3	4	12	6	8
(f) Lack of cooperation from executive agency(ies)	GAO	CRS	OTA	CBO	GAO	CRS	CBO	GAO	CRS
(g) Lack of access to specialized expertise	58	25	39	34	13	15	82	38	52
(h) Inadequate planning	40	40	42	20	22	20	60	62	62
(i) Lack of clear congressional intent in statute or legislative history; absence of standards or objectives by which to measure performance	73	12	37	35	5	22	108	17	59
	65	18	39	33	11	18	98	29	27

QUESTIONNAIRE 1.—COMBINED RESPONSES OF REPUBLICAN AND DEMOCRATIC MEMBERS SELECT COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES, NOV. 16, 1979—Continued

	Democrat			Republican			Combined		
	Yes	No	Undecided ¹	Yes	No	Undecided ¹	Yes	No	Undecided ¹
(j) Failure to follow through on oversight findings.....	71	10	41	36	6	20	107	16	61
F. COMMITTEE COSTS REDUCTION									
1. In general, do you believe significant reductions can be realized in the cost of committee operations without reducing committee effectiveness?	69	29	24	48	7	8	117	36	32
2. Please indicate for each of the following categories of committee costs whether you believe there is a potential for significant reductions:									
(a) Staff compensation.....	46	39	37	30	20	12	76	59	49
(b) Staff fringe benefits.....	29	47	46	14	28	20	43	75	64
(c) Travel.....	62	30	30	36	12	14	98	42	44
(d) Supplies and equipment.....	34	45	43	16	24	32	50	69	75
(e) Committee use of House Information Systems services.....	20	49	53	7	32	33	27	81	86
(f) Publications, reference materials.....	34	43	45	13	24	36	47	67	81
(g) Telephone service.....	23	45	54	6	29	37	29	74	91
3. Should committees be encouraged to consider the employment of short-term consultants in lieu of some full-time staff?	73	24	25	36	13	12	109	37	37

¹ Includes undecided and no answer.² Includes low and no answer.

QUESTIONNAIRE 2.—COMBINED RESPONSES OF REPUBLICAN AND DEMOCRATIC MEMBERS—SELECT COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES, JAN. 14, 1980

	Republican			Democrat			Combined		
	Yes	No	Undecided	Yes	No	Undecided	Yes	No	Undecided
A. COMMITTEE JURISDICTIONS—OBJECTIVES									
The way in which committee jurisdictions are structured or aligned should, presumably, be related to certain general objectives. Please indicate whether you agree or disagree with each of the following possible objectives:									
1. Improved coordination in the consideration of related policy issues.....	30	1	1	73	2	2	103	3	3
2. Enhanced opportunity to bring a broader variety of viewpoints and expertise to bear on major policy issues.....	20	6	6	54	8	15	74	14	21
3. More expeditious consideration of legislation at the committee level.....	21	9	2	60	8	9	81	17	11
4. Greater opportunity for specialization in specific policy areas.....	17	6	9	57	6	14	74	12	23
5. More evenly balanced workloads among committees.....	23	4	5	63	6	8	86	10	13
6. Reduced need for witnesses to appear before several committees on the same subject.....	27	1	4	65	6	6	92	7	10
7. Greater deliberation, more selectivity, less haste in committee consideration of legislation.....	23	6	3	54	6	17	77	12	20
8. Reduction of jurisdictional duplication and overlap among committees.....	31	0	1	70	2	5	101	2	6
9. Retention of present jurisdictions and procedures so as to prevent possibility of new problems resulting from change.....	5	23	4	14	51	12	19	74	16
10. Discourage excessively close relationships which tend to develop between committees and the agencies and interests they oversee.....	16	8	8	44	17	16	60	25	24
B. COMMITTEE JURISDICTIONS—OPTIONS									
Each of the following options for dealing with committee jurisdictions would advance one or more of the objectives listed above. For each option, please indicate whether you favor or oppose it:									
1. Provide for fewer committees with broader, more comprehensive jurisdictions.....	15	15	2	40	23	14	55	38	16
2. Provide for more committees with narrower, more specialized jurisdictions.....	5	25	2	2	63	12	7	88	14
3. Whatever the number of committees, assure that each has broad jurisdiction over related subjects.....	25	2	5	62	6	9	87	8	14
4. Insofar as possible, provide exclusive jurisdiction over any one subject in one committee.....	27	3	2	52	9	16	79	12	18
5. Retain the present number of committees and seek objectives through transfers of jurisdiction and/or use of multiple referral procedures.....	13	13	6	17	38	22	30	51	28
6. Realign committee jurisdictions to correspond with—									
(a) Jurisdictions of Senate committees.....	4	19	9	12	38	27	16	57	36
(b) Jurisdictions of Federal departments and agencies.....	16	9	7	22	28	27	38	37	43
7. Abolish committees with narrower jurisdictions and lighter workloads and transfer jurisdiction to other committees.....	18	10	4	48	11	18	66	21	22
8. Transfer portions of the jurisdictions of committees with heavier workloads to committees with lighter workloads.....	17	8	7	32	19	26	49	27	33
C. SPECIFIC JURISDICTIONAL CHANGE									
1. Following are several options for organizing jurisdiction over energy. For each please indicate whether you would find the option acceptable:									
(a) Establish a single energy committee by transferring jurisdiction from existing committees.....	20	10	2	44	21	12	64	31	14
(b) Consolidate nonfossil energy jurisdiction in 3 Committees with major energy responsibility (Commerce, Science and Technology, and Interior); require sequential referral of all bills with energy provisions reported by other committees to 1 of the 3.....	5	20	7	18	37	22	20	57	29
(c) Concentrate energy jurisdiction in 2 committees, 1 for research and development, the other for regulation, etc.....	9	17	6	13	36	28	22	53	34
(d) Leave energy jurisdiction unchanged and establish an ad hoc committee, without legislative authority, for steering, policy, and coordination purposes.....	5	23	4	9	50	18	14	73	22
(e) Abolish joint referral of energy bills; refer each bill to the appropriate "lead" committee and provide limited sequential referral (under strict time limits) where coordination is necessary.....	20	6	6	32	21	24	52	27	30
2. In addition, which of the following options do you prefer:									
(a) Environmental aspects of policy should be located within the appropriate energy committee.....	27	2	3	43	18	16	70	20	19
(b) Environmental aspects of energy policy should be located in a separate committee.....	2	22	7	18	38	21	20	60	28
3. If none of the above options is satisfactory, please summarize your views or recommendations regarding energy jurisdiction ¹									
4. In view of the widely varying workloads and jurisdictions among House Committees—									
(a) Which committee(s), if any, do you believe should be abolished and their jurisdiction(s) transferred to other committee(s) ²									
(b) What new committees, if any, should be established from the jurisdictions of existing committee(s) ²									
5. For the committees on which you serve, please indicate by committee and subject matter those areas in which you have found significant jurisdictional conflict with other committees ²									
6. For each of the following, please indicate whether you agree with the proposal for jurisdictional change (not necessarily those of the select committee or its members):									
(a) Transfer jurisdiction over water policy from—									
(i) Interior to Public Works.....	8	14	10	10	30	37	18	44	47
(ii) Public Works to Interior.....	11	10	11	36	13	28	47	23	39
(b) Transfer railroad transportation jurisdiction from Commerce to Public Works.....	12	14	6	25	28	24	37	42	30
(c) Consolidate jurisdiction over health matters in—									
(i) Commerce.....	14	8	10	27	22	28	41	30	38
(ii) Ways and Means.....	5	14	13	7	39	31	12	53	44
(iii) New Committee on Health.....	9	13	10	20	32	25	29	45	35
(d) Separate education and labor jurisdictions.....	12	11	9	33	30	14	45	41	22
(e) Combine jurisdiction over labor, postal service, and civil service in 1 committee.....	19	9	4	41	19	17	60	28	21
(f) Combine jurisdiction over pension and retirement programs in 1 committee.....	28	2	2	54	12	11	82	14	13
(g) Consolidate all environmental policy jurisdiction in 1 committee.....	14	12	6	39	26	12	53	38	18
7. What other specific transfers of jurisdiction between committees would you recommend? ²									
D. INTELLIGENCE									
1. Currently, 4 House committees are authorized to receive information about CIA covert activities: Select Intelligence, Foreign Affairs, Appropriations, and Armed Services.									
(a) Should intelligence information be provided to fewer committees to protect its security?.....	17	7	8	24	36	17	41	43	25
(b) Should the present system be continued to assure effective oversight of covert activities?.....	10	13	9	31	24	22	41	37	31
(c) If fewer committees should be authorized to receive intelligence information which committee(s) should be so authorized? ²									
2. Would you favor a single joint House-Senate Committee on Intelligence?.....									
	18	10	4	25	32	20	43	42	24

QUESTIONNAIRE 2.—COMBINED RESPONSES OF REPUBLICAN AND DEMOCRATIC MEMBERS—SELECT COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES, JAN. 14, 1980—Continued

	Republican			Democrat			Combined		
	Yes	No	Undecided	Yes	No	Undecided	Yes	No	Undecided
E. MULTIPLE REFERRAL PROCEDURES									
The referral of bills, or parts of bills, to 2 or more committees is designed to assure that all committees with jurisdiction and expertise review legislation in their fields, though the process often delays or blocks legislation. Please indicate whether you agree with the following possible changes in the multiple referral process:									
1. Impose mandatory time limits for reporting, favorably or unfavorably, all measures multiply referred (joint, split, sequential)	21	4		7	47	16	14	68	20
2. Abolish joint referrals and rely on split and sequential referrals	9	13		10	22	24	31	31	37
3. On all joint referrals, designate a lead committee and permit that committee to seek a rule, if the other committee(s) to the referral have not reported within a specified time after the lead committee reports, and manage bill on the floor	17	5		10	51	7	19	68	12
4. When a measure is jointly referred and subcommittees of each of the committees in the referral are considering the measure, permit those subcommittees to merge temporarily as a "special" committee to report directly to the House	10	15		7	39	14	24	49	29

F. ADDITIONAL RECOMMENDATIONS/COMMENTS

See footnote 7.

¹ Question C.3. Broad oversight by several—leadership limits time for consideration under sequential referrals.² Consolidate to every extent possible, smooth out referral system.³ Environmental aspects must be protected.⁴ Make jurisdictions flexible—able to change from Congress to Congress.⁵ Several of the above are preferable to the present structure—hence, I have checked those which are at least better than what we have.

Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas. My colleagues will note something interesting. A majority of both Democrats and Republicans in this survey agreed that the committee system was in disarray, that the committee system revision is so necessary that it should be pursued even if Members saw themselves adversely affected by specific jurisdictional or other changes, that the number of subcommittees should be reduced and the committee staffs are too big. That is both Democrats and Republicans. And they agreed to all of this, even though it would personally affect them.

If there are issues about which a significant number of us can agree, then our goals should therefore become quite clear and we do have common ground for discussion. A former Member of Congress once said a Congressman has become an expanded messenger boy, an employment agency, a getter-outter of the Navy, Army, and Marines, a ward healer, a wound healer, troubleshooter, law explainer, bill finder, issue translator, resolution interpreter, controversy oil pourer, glad hand extender, business promoter, convention goer, civil ills skirmisher, veterans' affairs adjuster, ex-servicemen champion and watchdog of the underdog.

Does that sound familiar? That statement was made 36 years ago, in 1949. In 1965, former chairman of the House Rules Committee, Richard Bolling, a Democrat from my area of the country, also considered one of the leading experts of congressional reform, commented, "With such a patchwork of assignments which sometimes take up to 90 percent of the time of Members and their staffs, there is little time left for the primary function of a legislator, making laws."

At this time I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL], our distinguished minority leader, who introduced the package of rules that we would like to have considered here on the floor.

Mr. MICHEL. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding, and I want to

commend her for taking this special order to discuss the matter of reforming this House, a matter about which we on this side of the aisle have strong feelings.

Mr. Speaker, Rick McIntyre ought to be here in this Chamber. He isn't. His absence tells a story that could fill volumes of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. The events which led up to his loss of a congressional seat he rightfully won reflect a pattern of mismanagement and misuse of this institution.

This Chamber has been under Democratic control since 1955, 30 years straight. Never before in the history of this House has a party held power for so long.

Unlike wine and cheese, power does not improve with age. It tends to become corrosive and abusive. Those who hold power for that length of time forget the House of Representatives isn't their's—it's the people's.

That's why we offered the McIntyre House reform amendments. We want to make the legislative process more open, accountable and efficient. That is why the majority has done nothing with them. They don't want what we want.

The Speaker once said, "we have too much openness." I beg to disagree. We don't have enough openness. Among other things, the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD fails to present an accurate picture of what is said and done on the House floor. We're proposing to make the RECORD a verbatim account of this Chamber's proceedings.

Accountability—that's really just another word for representation. You can't represent people if you can hide your positions from them. If this Chamber is truly going to be the people's house, the key issues have to come up for debate and vote, so the people can know where their lawmakers stand. As Sam Rayburn once said: "I think this House should be allowed on great measures to work its will." On this score, the majority party has let the people down.

Key initiatives, such as enterprise zones and immigration reform remain frozen in committee. As the rules stand now, Members can petition to discharge a committee from consideration of a bill. But signatures can't be made public until they reach the required number of 218. This secrecy takes public pressure off those who haven't signed.

We proposed that the signatures be made public as soon as 100 Members sign. That figure is low enough to ensure openness yet high enough to discourage abuse of this procedure.

Congress is a billion-dollar boondoggle. Just to take 1 example, our postage costs are 10 times what they were in 1970. Last year, the House alone sent out 586 million pieces of mail. That's too much mail and a whole lot more than Congress received.

The McIntyre amendments direct the Franking Commission to study abuses in this area, with a view to achieving at least a 10-percent cost reduction.

We're proposing a number of other reforms. They'll be explained later. For now, I just want to offer this closing observation.

Eleven years ago, the Speaker was serving as majority leader. On May 9, 1974, the Democratic caucus rejected a proposal for rules reform. He explained their action with these words: "The name of the game is power, and the boys don't want to give it up."

No, the work of this House should not be a game, and its name should not be power. We're here to do the people's business as fairly and efficiently as we can. Let's acknowledge that by passing the McIntyre reform amendments.

I want to applaud the gentlewoman again for what she has done here to bring to the attention of the House that array of reforms that we now present to the House of Representatives again in the name of McIntyre reforms, because we think that symbolizes exactly what we are talking about here.

Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas. I thank the gentleman for his remarks. I appreciate his being here tonight and I congratulate our distinguished leader for introducing this package of reforms. I am pleased that the gentleman could be here with us to participate in this special order tonight.

At this time I yield to my colleague, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. WHITTAKER].

Mr. WHITTAKER. Mr. Speaker, I commend my colleague, the gentleman from Kansas, JAN MEYERS, for giving us this opportunity to focus on some reforms needed to make this body more accountable and fair. Through her leadership of the House Republican Task Force on Congressional Reform, Congresswoman MEYERS is making a great contribution to making this institution more representative and democratic. As a newly elected Member of this body, JAN has distinguished herself as one who is willing and able to take on the age-old issue of making the House more fair, open, and honest.

Many of our constituents sit in the gallery of this great Chamber wondering why many of us are not here on the House floor tending to our duties. They come to understand that much of the work—indeed, most of the work—done by Congress takes place in the committee rooms scattered about Capitol Hill. With a few notable exceptions, most of the substantive battles in hammering out legislation are fought away from this Chamber, in committee.

My Energy and Commerce Committee is quickly becoming one of the most productive committees in the Congress. As the Washington Post recently observed, it's there that we shape legislation that affects every American who "breathes, drinks, eats, smokes, watches TV and movies, listens to the radio, drives, plays the stock market, needs medical care, pays for insurance, enjoys sports, worries about hazardous waste and nuclear powerplants, buys faulty products, rides the railroads or gets buried." I happen to think that's important work. That's why I am keenly concerned about the need to make membership on all House committees more fair and representative.

The minority party, the Republican Party, holds 42 percent of the seats in this House. Yet, on some of the key committees, where critical decisions are made nearly every day, we're woefully underrepresented. For instance, on the Appropriations Committee, we hold only 22 of 57 seats, or 36 percent. On the Rules Committee, which dictates the way in which every piece of legislation is considered on the House floor, we hold 31 percent of the 13 seats. On the Ways and Means Committee, we hold only 13 of the 36 seats, or 36 percent of the seats. Believe it or

not, the distribution of subcommittee assignments is even less equitable than for full committee seats. That's right: of the 1,673 subcommittee slots, we Republicans hold only 39 percent.

Mr. Speaker, I respectfully request that the chart reflecting the imbalance of committee and subcommittee assignments be printed in the RECORD so that our colleagues can see the inequity which has raised my concern.

COMMITTEE AND SUBCOMMITTEE RATIOS IN THE 99TH CONGRESS

The House has 770 committee slots and 1,673 subcommittee slots (not counting slots for nonvoting delegates). If the Republican Party's share of these totals matched its strength in the House, it would have 14 more committee slots and 46 more subcommittee slots. This problem is important because these bodies often make decisions by narrow margins. And the discrepancy is greatest where it matters most. On the three exclusive committees (Appropriations, Rules, Ways and Means), Republicans have only 37 percent of the committee slots and 35 percent of the subcommittee slots, compared with their 42 percent of House seats. See the table below:

FULL COMMITTEE

	Democrat	Percent	Republican	Percent
Agriculture.....	26	60	17	40
Appropriations.....	35	64	22	36
Armed Services.....	27	59	19	41
Banking.....	28	60	19	40
Budget.....	20	61	13	39
District of Columbia.....	7	64	4	36
Education and Labor.....	19	59	13	41
Energy and Commerce.....	25	60	17	40
Foreign Affairs.....	25	60	17	40
Government Operations.....	23	60	16	40
House Administration.....	12	63	7	37
Interior.....	22	59	15	41
Judiciary.....	21	60	14	40
Merchant Marine.....	25	60	17	40
Post Office.....	13	62	8	38
Public Works.....	9	59	19	41
Rules.....	24	69	4	31
Science and Technology.....	24	59	17	41
Small Business.....	25	60	17	40
Standards of Official Conduct.....	6	50	6	50
Veterans' Affairs.....	20	59	14	41
Ways and Means.....	23	64	13	36
Total.....	462	60	308	40

SUBCOMMITTEES

	Democrat	Percent	Republican	Percent
Agriculture.....	72	63	43	37
Appropriations.....	86	65	47	35
Armed Services.....	67	61	43	39
Banking.....	92	58	67	42
Budget.....	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)
District of Columbia.....	12	57	9	43
Education and Labor.....	53	63	31	37
Energy and Commerce.....	68	62	42	38
Foreign Affairs.....	56	61	36	39
Government Operations.....	39	61	25	39
House Administration.....	29	62	18	38
Interior.....	59	58	43	42
Judiciary.....	46	61	30	39
Merchant Marine.....	68	60	46	40
Post Office.....	21	58	15	42
Public Works.....	74	61	48	39
Rules.....	10	71	4	29
Science and Technology.....	51	61	32	39
Small Business.....	33	60	22	40
Standards of Official Conduct.....	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)
Veterans' Affairs.....	41	59	29	41
Ways and Means.....	42	64	24	36
Total.....	1,019	61	654	39

¹No subcommittees.

There are three measures pending before the House Rules Committee

which would address the imbalance in committee assignments. House Resolution 24, introduced by my friend Mr. DANNEMEYER, would correct the disproportionate seating of members of House committees. House Resolution 110, the Committee Improvements Act of 1985, offered by Mr. LOTT, would restore equitable party ratios on all committees. And House Resolution 164, the McIntyre House Reform amendments, offered by the minority leader, Mr. MICHEL, would require membership to reflect the ratio of majority to minority members of the whole Congress. Mr. Speaker, each of these measures is languishing in the Rules Committee. If we had a fighting chance on that committee—or any other committee, for that matter—we might take some meaningful steps to making this body more fair and representative.

Mr. Speaker, allow me to cite one other statistic that should be of interest. In House races in 1984, where both major parties fielded candidates, Republicans won just over 50 percent of the total popular vote. But, on the committees and subcommittees of this body, we're considered lucky to have 40 percent representation. That's not fair. What's more, that 50 percent of American voters know that's not fair. They expect equity in this body. And, if they can't get it from the current majority party, they might encourage some of their friends to join them in voting for Republicans in the elections to come.

Mr. Speaker, we Republicans climbed into this ring knowing what to expect. I gladly entered my fourth term serving the people of the Fifth District of Kansas. We aren't asking the majority party's heavy-weights to take a fall. We're just asking you to give us a fighting chance.

□ 1820

Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas. I would like to thank my colleague, the gentleman from Kansas, for his incisive remarks and for calling our attention to those figures.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield to the distinguished chairman of the Republican Study Committee, my colleague from California [Mr. LEWIS].

Mr. LEWIS of California. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, before going on with my own remarks, JAN, I would like to express my deep appreciation for the work that you have done in connection with the vital, indeed, the fundamental job we have to do in terms of reorganizing this House.

It is very clear to anybody who even takes a cursory review of the way this place operates that there is a need for not just light, there is a need, indeed, for radical change in the House of Representatives. If the public had an

opportunity to sit where we are, and viewed the exercise of power that we watch day in and day out, they would be more than appalled. Indeed, I think there would be the groundswell that could lead to revolution out there in the hinterlands.

It has been said many a time that power does corrupt and that absolute power corrupts absolutely. It is not the power per se in my view, but rather the arrogance that often goes with power held too long. This I say not in a partisan sense. You have heard commentary earlier regarding some of the partisan difficulties that we face in the House. But the fact is that most of the public recognizes that the vast percentage of the problems we face in this country really have very little to do with partisan politics. If we would come together representing the people, seeking change and solution to problems instead of spending so much of our time in partisan bickering. Indeed, the House would have a chance of regaining the confidence it needs on the part of the public to effectively lead.

The difficulty we have historically in our country is that oftentimes one party gets a good deal of control in the House and they extend that control for too long a period of time, and with that extended control comes that element of arrogance of which I speak.

Indeed, at this point in time it is clear to those who control this place that they dominate the place, and it is their right to exercise their power at free will with little consideration for the voice of the minority. The absolutely unbelievable distortion of the committee apportionments; that which takes place in terms of using the rules here to dominate debate. The inability of people operating in a nonpartisan way to have the minority's voice heard in the mix where decisions are made is a fundamental violation of our democratic process.

It is so important that not just our Members, but America focus upon the work that you are about, my colleague, that indeed, if they begin to get an understanding, you yourself, will be responsible for a piece of that revolution that I personally am beginning to sign onto myself.

The work that you are about is not just fundamental to we who represent the minority, but I think very important to the future of the world's greatest deliberative body. This institution will be much better off as a result of your contribution, and I appreciate it.

Mr. Speaker, what we're discussing here today boils down to one question: Shall the rules of this House foster leadership or raw power?

These terms often get confused, but leadership is as different from raw power as music is from noise.

True leaders are like orchestra conductors. They strive for harmony and

balance in a room full of talent and temperament. They try to make sure that no one section overpowers the others, so that everyone can contribute to the final product. Leadership is really a creative act, whether the product is a symphony or a well-crafted piece of legislation.

Now look at those who deal in raw power. Raw power isn't creative, it's destructive. Instead of working for harmony, power players just turn up the volume and try to drown out anyone who disagrees. They might get a fleeting rush of satisfaction from making the loudest noise, but they don't make anything of value.

Leadership makes us proud. Raw power leaves us bitter.

The great leaders of the House always understood this. Perhaps the greatest of them all was Sam Rayburn. He put it this way:

We're all grown up now. A man's got to lead by persuasion and kindness and best reason . . . You can't lead people by driving them.

Just as musicians or craftsmen respect their instruments, true leaders take care not to abuse the rules of the House. Again, Sam Rayburn set the example. He didn't arbitrarily fix committee ratios; instead he relied on the Parliamentarian of the House, Lewis Deschler, to work out a fairly routine process for translating party strength in the Chamber to party strength in committees.

Unfortunately, not every officer of the House has been a Sam Rayburn. At some points in history, the rules have been abused. In 1910, the Republicans were in the majority, a position they had held for 15 years straight. Over that period, they had lost sight of the need for harmony and balance. Their leaders grew rude and arrogant—even to their own rank and file.

Resentment grew. Eventually a bipartisan coalition rose up and forced reforms in the rules. An Alabama Democrat named Oscar Underwood explained the reformers' case in words that have a contemporary ring:

We are fighting a system and that system is the system that enables the Speaker, by the power vested in him, to thwart and overthrow the will of the majority membership of this house.

One of the reforms that grew out of this revolt was the discharge petition. And now, 75 years later, the discharge petition is again part of a reform movement. Thwarted time and again in our efforts to bring key issues up for a floor vote, we want to make the discharge petition a more effective instrument by bringing it into the sunshine.

Does reform have a chance in 1985? I think it does. Many Members on both sides of the aisle are distressed at the way the House is run. In fact, even the Speaker and the majority leader have spoken of the need for fairness

and civility. In 1977, the Speaker made these promises on taking office:

I pledge to be patient, good-tempered and courteous toward individual Members. I pledge best to employ the talent of the House for full and fair consideration of issues that come before us. . . . I pledge to remain cool and unshaken, guarding the permanent laws and rules of the House from being sacrificed to temporary passions, prejudices and interests.

And here's what the majority leader wrote in his fine book "Reflections of a Public Man":

The assumption of mutual honor, I have come to learn, is not merely a staid and stuffy formal prop for sagging egos. It is part of the very oxygen which fuels the bloodstream of the Congress. Without it, our national task of legislating would be a vastly different and more difficult thing.

Well, I'm afraid that the task of legislating has become different since the days of Sam Rayburn—and the officers of the majority must take their share of the responsibility. Their actions have not always matched their words. But it doesn't have to be that way. The House of Representatives can be a place of harmony and balance, a place ruled by reason instead of raw power. And reforming the rules can be a good first step toward that goal.

Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas. I thank the gentleman from California [Mr. LEWIS].

Mr. Speaker, at this time I would like to read a quote from Mr. Bolling, who worked very hard. A Democrat from the Kansas City area who worked very hard on Rules, and in his Book entitled, "A House Out of Order," written in 1965, Mr. Bolling stated:

The Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 appeared to make great changes in the institutional form of the Congress. However, time has brought disappointment. The reduction in the number of standing committees has been offset by the creation of more and more standing subcommittees within each full standing legislative committee. The work of Congress, therefore, remains fragmented and uncoordinated.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RIDGE].

Mr. RIDGE. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the gentlewoman for her initiative. A process as important as policy and the positive approach that you have taken toward institutional reform and hopefully, the bipartisan support that you are trying to nurture through this initiative is indeed an admirable one, and I appreciate the time to share a few thoughts with you and exchange a few ideas with you as part of that process.

I believe there is a quote attributed to Alexander Hamilton about the House of Representatives. It says: "Here, sir, the people govern."

Having served just a term and a half, and still pretty much a novice, but

having been around long enough to appreciate the process, I kind of suspect that if the people knew precisely and accurately how we govern, they would yearn for many of the same reforms that the gentlewoman is promoting.

I think the approach that the gentlewoman has taken is not a critical one, it is a constructive one. Indeed, all legislators on both sides of the aisle hopefully will view your efforts and similar efforts in the future in that fashion. I know that in the resolution that you have drafted and are promoting there are many institutional reforms, and I wanted to just address a couple of them in a very practical and real way confronting the problems that you and I and our fellow legislators confront on a day-to-day basis.

The oversight reform recommendation that you have included in your package is indeed a necessary one, and you suggest that committees would be required to formally adopt and submit to the Government Operations Committee by March 1 of the first session their oversight plans for that Congress.

□ 1830

Coincidentally, it matches very comfortably with a view that I have that we would be a lot better off if we went to a 2-year budget process and exercised a great deal more oversight. We have tendency, as an institution, to be very responsive to problems, often in a crisis situation, and we respond to those problems more often than not in a bipartisan effort, and we respond to them by authorizing and then appropriating money, hoping to find a solution. Rarely do we follow the money out the door to see whether or not it properly addressed and then redressed the problems that we initially confronted.

So the oversight reform indeed is an important measure.

The multiple referral to committees, we saw a perfect example of that particular problem today with regard to the synfuels debate that we had on the floor. Clearly, we had an issue that our fellow Congressmen and Congresswomen wanted to address. There were some policy objections, of course, to the Synfuels Program and there was a concern, some procedural objections, that the individual committees that had concurrent jurisdiction had not had the opportunity to work their will.

Indeed, we have such a decentralized system that we literally have hundreds of committees and subcommittees, and multiple referral has not proven to be as effective as it has proven to be somewhat cumbersome, and then, again, the situation that we saw today is clearly a demonstration of that problem.

Proxy voting, I think it is pretty clear, is a tool, a mechanism, that is

used again by our colleagues on both sides of the aisle. I am not confident at all that it is used in a manner that responsible legislators approve of, although it is a necessity at times because again of the decentralized nature of our system, the reliance on efforts in the committees and subcommittees, and when we have that proliferation of subcommittees and we have competing demands on individual legislators' time, it is, therefore, not unusual or unique that we would have a proxy voting mechanism.

But clearly, if we are to meet the gentlewoman's objective, and I think the objective of responsible legislators everywhere to have a responsive and responsible system, a representative system, then clearly we do not want to abuse our responsibility as legislators, and clearly when those many, many occasions arise when we all leave proxies to be voted on our behalf, oftentimes in support of or against individual amendments that we may only have a vague idea about, and as we well know, many of those amendments arise spontaneously and the vote can be cast on an amendment, procedural or substantive, by someone holding our proxy, and we have not addressed that ourselves and left explicit instructions. I am not saying it is an abuse of the process; I am saying that because of the decentralized nature of our system, we come to rely on it too heavily.

The gentlewoman has also asked this body to take a look at the number of committees and subcommittees and I think that ties neatly in with that recommendation that you have made, as well, and indeed it is a very strong one and hopefully one that will be endorsed by majority Members on both sides of the aisle.

Finally, scheduling reform, as the gentlewoman well knows and appreciates, during this 1st session of the 99th Congress, the responsibilities of individual Members, you have read the litany, a marvelous litany of tasks that we are called upon to do on a daily basis. If we narrowed it down, I guess we would have to say that we have to be ombudsmen and deal with bureaucracy and help our constituents work their way through the system, and we have to be legislators and have to do all those other things that you mentioned in that litany.

Yet, we rarely have a schedule that we can rely upon, that our staffs, who work so diligently with us can rely upon to serve the constituents who send us here. So often it is the case that we begin the week not knowing when the week will end. It is difficult if not impossible to schedule functions at home, meetings with constituents at home, addressing those real problems, real personal and people problems back home in the district.

So I realize the gentlewoman has prepared a summary of quite a few recommendations, and I appreciate the opportunity to express my support for her initiative and my particular concern about four or five of these particular areas.

Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas. I would like very much to thank the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania for being with us tonight and participating in this special order and for emphasizing those particular reforms that he thinks are most important.

Mr. Speaker, it is interesting to note that the House has 770 committee slots and 673 subcommittee slots, not counting slots for nonvoting delegates.

If the Republican Party's share of these totals matched its strength in the House, it would have 14 more committee seats and 46 more subcommittee seats. This inequity is important because these bodies often make decisions by narrow margins. The discrepancy is greatest where it matters most.

On the three major committees, Appropriations, Rules, and Ways and Means, Republicans have only 37 percent of the committee slots, and 35 percent of the subcommittee slots, compared with 42 percent of the House seats.

This is only one example of the types of reforms that we are suggesting, and I urge that my colleagues on both sides of the aisle join me in making the House of Representatives more fair and efficient. We hope that the discharge petition is successful and that we will be considering this package of rules that was submitted by our distinguished minority leader.

These do have to do with a number of reforms that have already been mentioned by my colleagues tonight: Oversight reform, multiple referral of legislation, the joint referral of bills to two or more committees would be abolished and replaced by a system wherein the Speaker would designate a committee of principal jurisdiction.

Committee elections and organization. The House would be required to elect its committees not later than 5 legislative days after the convening of a Congress. This year I think it was into February before all of our committees were appointed.

Committee ratios. The party ratios on committees, which we have already referred to on several occasions, would be required to reflect the party ratio in the House, and especially on those important committees of Appropriations, Ways and Means, and Rules.

Subcommittee limits. Each House committee except Appropriations would be limited to not more than six subcommittees.

A proxy voting ban. I do not know how many Americans know that frequently so much of the work in this body is done in committees. Many im-

portant votes are cast in committees, and I do not know how many of our constituents know that many of these votes are cast by proxy, by a piece of paper that we sign a day ahead of time.

As one of my colleagues mentioned, it is sometimes necessary now, because if we have two committees that are scheduled at the same time, it is necessary that one sign one of the proxies. However, if we had scheduling reform and did not have such a proliferation of committees and subcommittees, it would not be necessary to rely so heavily on proxies.

Majority quorums. A majority quorum would be required for the transaction of business on all committees and subcommittees.

Committee documents. All committee documents and prints would require the formal approval of the committee and must carry a clear disclaimer to the contrary on their cover if it has not been approved by the full committee.

There are many of these rules. All Rules Committees reporting on special rules providing for the consideration of legislation would be required to include a justification and explanation of any comments received from the Budget Committee on any Budget Act waivers. It is important that if we have to waive the Budget Act that we explain why; that there be a strong justification for doing so.

Reforms in committee staffing. In riders, appropriations riders, the present rule prohibiting limitation amendments to appropriation bills, unless a complicated procedure is gone through, would be abolished, thus permitting limitation amendments to be considered simultaneously with other amendments.

Measures could not be considered under suspension of the rules unless by direction of the committees of jurisdiction or upon written request by the chairman and ranking member of the committees of jurisdiction.

Copies of discharge motions and signatures would be made available by the Clerk for public inspection at any time after 100 Members have signed the motion. Now no one can see who has signed discharge petitions.

□ 1840

Verbatim accounts of floor and committee remarks would be required in the published *Record* and made clearly distinguishable from any extensions or extraneous material. Any substantive alteration of floor or committee verbatim accounts would be subject to investigation by the Ethics Committee. Members or their designees would still be permitted to make technical, grammatical, or typographical corrections, of course, in their verbatim remarks, but not substantive changes.

A new House broadcast rule would establish a House broadcast system under the authority of the Speaker and a bipartisan broadcast advisory board.

The Committee on Rules would be authorized and directed to study the operation of House rule XI regarding committee procedures and staffing, the number of subcommittee and member subcommittee assignments, and report back its findings and recommendations to the House; and certainly House scheduling reform so we do not end up with overlapping committees. It would involve the Speaker of the House in consultation with the majority and minority members, and the Rules and House Administration Committees would be authorized and directed to study current House scheduling with a view to implementing a system of full work weeks, designated committee meeting times, a fixed legislative floor schedule, and established district work periods, and report the findings to the full House.

The House Commission on Congressional Mailing Standards would be authorized and directed to study the current House franking rule. The committee must approve by vote with quorum present the hiring of consultants or temporary staff detailed with other agencies. No committee report could be filed until the chairman has consulted with the ranking minority member, making the committees much more representative.

There are 25 suggested reforms here. If this body could discuss this for 10 hours, I think it would be educational. It would reveal to the American people some of the abuses that I think are going on and some of the problems in scheduling that all of us on both sides of the aisle have.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate very much the participation of my colleagues in this special order tonight, and I urge all Members to sign the discharge petition so that we can consider this package of rules.

● Mr. DAUB. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a resolution which will permit the American people true representation in Congress by prohibiting the use of proxy voting in the committees of the House of Representatives. If it is true, as Woodrow Wilson once commented, that "Congress at work is Congress in committee," then we should adopt this resolution to insure the integrity of the proceedings.

The vast bulk of the truly significant work and legislative decisions made by the House of Representatives are accomplished through committees. Given the size of our membership and the complex nature of the business at hand, there can hardly be any alternative. Our fundamental responsibilities to maintain the integrity of the legislative process, however, are not less-

ened because we chose to proceed under this committee system.

Now I understand the arguments for maintaining proxy voting:

"There are just too many votes."

"There are too many issues."

"There are too many meetings."

"There are too many commitments of my time."

I do not understand, however, what any of those arguments have to do with the basic notion of responsible Government. Is it too much to ask our Members to represent their particular constituents' interests in person? Do the Members have any more important interests that their participation on the floor and in committee? Are our Members so overworked that having to cast important votes in person will stretch them too far? I doubt it.

My colleagues on the other side of the aisle are frequently extolling the virtues of opening up the system of Government and being truly democratic—with a small d. There is much talk of participation openness and candor in the process. Yet the reality is that the committee system in conjunction with proxy voting vests a committee chairman with the ability to manipulate the committee function. Committee chairmen frequently can acquire a majority of votes through proxies on a partisan basis and eliminate the reason for any Member to attend the committee meeting, listen to testimony in the committee meeting, or even vote in the committee meeting.

Even with this kind of abuse, the issue is something much more than simply a partisan matter. Proxy voting strikes at the fundamental principles of our democratic system of Government; the right of Americans to travel to the seat of Government and be heard, the right of Americans to expect legislation to develop from meaningful debate and compromise, and the right of Americans to expect that their Representative is just that—"Representative."

Visit most any committee function on any given day and then try to suggest to me that the testimony is being heard and understood by all the Members, that there is meaningful debate, and that all the interests of each of the members of the committee are being represented. How can we be truly responsive to the issues of the day when Members infrequently attend hearings and only participate when necessary to accomplish some parliamentary procedure? Moreover, how can we be truly democratic when Members hold a fistful of proxies and the issues are resolved by a single Member before the debate even begins? Without meaningful participation by all committee members, the

committee system is only expedient, certainly not democratic.

For this reason, I urge all my colleagues to join with the 42 Members from both sides of the aisle who have cosponsored House Resolution 154. The integrity of the system and our democratic principles are at issue. ●

● Mr. LOTT. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join in this special order of the gentlelady from Kansas [Mrs. MEYERS] on the subject of House rules reform. I not only want to commend the gentlelady on taking this special order, but on her initiative on introducing a special rule as the first step in bringing the Republican House reform package to the floor under the discharge procedure.

Mr. Speaker, as a member of the minority party on the Rules Committee I am all too familiar on how difficult it is to bring any meaningful House reform proposals to the floor. For three consecutive Congresses now I have introduced a package of House reform proposals called the "committee improvement amendments." On occasion my majority colleagues have been kind enough to grant me a hearing, but nothing much has happened beyond that. Why? Well, I think it should be obvious that the majority is fairly comfortable with the status quo—our present way of doing things. And, I suspect if we had been in control of the House for as long as the Democrats have, we might also have that attitude of not wanting to make waves or rock the boat.

Many of these rules do work to the advantage of the majority. Proxy voting and lopsided majority party representation on committees are but two examples. They make it easier for the majority to operate and prevail. But that begs the question of whether they are fair or democratic procedures. The fact is, they are neither. We need to abolish proxy voting and restore equitable party ratios on committees as the Republican reform package would do.

Another central problem of our institution is the proliferation of subcommittees we've had over the last decade. I think at last count there were some 146 House subcommittees—up from 119 just 10 years ago—a 22-percent increase. And yet, the number of standing committees has remained relatively constant over that period. The number of House Members has remained the same. What all this means is that we have the same people with the same time available expected to do much more work. Many Members have over six subcommittee assignments. We're spread too thin, and as a result we're doing a poor job of legislating. It's little wonder that the majority needs such phantom legislative devices as proxy voting and one-third quorums to do business.

What the Republican reform package would do would be to limit each committee, except Appropriations, to no more than six subcommittees, and each Member to no more than four subcommittee assignments.

This would result in the elimination of some 16 subcommittees—an 11-percent reduction. It would also result in a substantial reduction in the number of subcommittee assignments of Members.

Not only would these changes make it possible to eliminate the need for proxy voting and to restore majority quorum requirements, as our package would do, but they would make possible a reduction in committee staff. Our proposal would call for at least a 10-percent reduction in existing committee staff. Moreover, it would require the House to establish and abide by overall committee staff ceilings each year before committee expense resolutions are adopted. With the reduction in subcommittees there should be no problem in reducing the staff we have. House committee staff is now around 1,800—up over 100 percent from a decade ago. While a case might be made that we were understaffed then, an even stronger case can be made that we are highly overstaffed now.

Mr. Speaker, while I have not touched on all of the provisions in the Republican reform package, I have attempted to focus on the central problems of this institution and how we would resolve them. I hope the Rules Committee will break with precedent and take a serious look at what has been sincerely proposed on this side. Although this is a Republican initiative, it is not partisan. I think my colleagues will agree after looking at this that it is in the best interests of the House as an institution to make our workload more manageable and our procedures more fair and democratic. I again commend our House reform corps group for taking this special order and keeping these issues before us. ●

● Mr. McKERNAN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to have the opportunity to speak today on the issue of House rules reform. In the day-to-day flurry of legislative activity, it is easy to lose sight of the importance of focusing on the rules which govern House proceedings. Yet, they are the mechanism which ensures that major legislative business will be carried forward. House rules are the vehicle which should enable all Members of Congress, and thus all citizens of the United States, to have a fair and equal opportunity to be represented in the legislative process.

Rules are the wheels and sprockets of the legislative process—they need constant attention to ensure that they are in good working order. It is clear, however, by the very fact that we are

here today, that all is not in good working order in the House. We are all too well aware that the McIntyre-McCloskey seating dispute involving Indiana's Eighth District came as close as any event in recent history to derailing this body from its proper legislative track. We must not forget the lessons we learned from this event.

The McIntyre-McCloskey issue developed into more than just a question of who won and who lost on November 6, 1984. Likewise—the issues that are being discussed today, such as committee ratios and quorums, and numbers of subcommittees—go far beyond being a question of mere numbers. The McIntyre-McCloskey issue helped focus attention on the problems in this institution. These problems are often cast in a partisan light, but they affect every Member of the House, and, more importantly, every one of his or her constituents.

Issues such as committee ratios, proxy voting in committees, the proliferation of subcommittees, the franking privilege, scheduling of the workload of the House—must be examined, and reforms made, if we are to carry out the business of the House as the founders of our country intended.

As just one example, the overall underrepresentation of the minority party on committees and subcommittees is well-documented. And, the overriding importance of the committee and subcommittee system in legislative decisionmaking only serves to magnify this imbalance.

Another issue of recurring interest is the accuracy of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. The importance of ensuring that the RECORD is an accurate representation of the proceedings of the House cannot be overestimated. The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is supposed to be an accurate and precise record of this body's proceedings—and it is our collective duty to ensure that it is by enacting reforms to help make the RECORD truly a verbatim account of what happens on the floor.

Our serious consideration of these and other reforms is imperative. I commend my colleague, Congresswoman MEYERS, for her leadership on this issue, and look forward to working with her to achieve this goal. ●

● Mr. MILLER of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, last week, in an effort to give notice that a majority of the Members of the House were against the House rule that presently permits each Member of this body to send out, at Government expense, six districtwide postal patron mailings a year, I offered an amendment to cut \$10 million from the official mail account of the legislative appropriations bill. Though this amendment fell a few votes short of passage, in retrospect I felt that if I had been able to present this issue in a

more direct fashion it may have passed.

Toward this end, I plan to introduce a bill to amend the House rule that presently permits each Member of this body to make six postal patron mailings a year from six to three annually. As I mentioned in my floor remarks last week, this could result in savings in mail costs alone of up to \$22 million a year.

We heard during the debate on the legislative appropriations bill how our incoming mail has increased over the years and how the appropriations allocation for official mail was a bare-boned proposal. Little mention was made of the fact that only 3 to 4 percent of the mail costs incurred by the legislative branch of Government go for personal letters to constituents.

What then, one is compelled to ask, does the balance of this official mail account pay for? The largest and most costly form of mail sent out by the Congress is clearly newsletter mail sent out under the bulk rate. Figures show that almost three times as much mail is sent out by the Congress as it receives, and that, not too surprisingly, the year's when the volume of outgoing mail are the highest are the even numbered election years when Members of Congress are most intent in telling their respective constituencies of the great job they are doing. I don't think anyone in this Chamber can in good conscience deny that six districtwide postal patron mailings annually are an unnecessary extravagance that we as Members of Congress could and should cut back on.

It is one thing to talk of reform, it is another thing to act on it. I hope this body will have what it takes to follow through on many of the proposals put forth here today. We talk of efficiency and fairness in Government—it is time we started practicing it.●

● Mr. LAGOMARSINO. Mr. Speaker, I'd like to commend the gentlelady from Kansas for bringing this matter to the attention of the House and our viewing audience. Those who watch us on TV must wonder from time to time at the things that go on on the House floor. With good reason.

What they are watching, in essence, is a rigged game. The rules are rigged in favor of the majority party, the party of the Speaker, the Democrats. Because they have a majority of the votes in the House, they operate as they please. Unlike any other Government body, agency, or court in this land, the the Congress makes it own rules. And when it feels like it, it breaks them with impunity. It is a tyranny of the majority, with no rights accorded to the minority. This despite the fact that in the last Congressional elections, last November, nearly half the people who voted, voted for the Republican candidate for the House. These voters, in effect, are disenfran-

chised by the rules adopted by the Democratic majority in the House.

Rules, for example, that deny Republicans seats on House committees in proportion to their numbers. That deny us a fair share of the staff appointments on House committees, and a fair share of the operating funds.

But the minority party and the people they represent are not the only ones who are cheated by these rules. The public as a whole, Democrats, Independents, and Republicans are denied access to and knowledge of House processes, by such practices as systematic falsification of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and committee hearing transcripts, by committees which operate without quorums and with proxy votes, and by the regular waiver of even those stacked House rules, even of the law, whenever it suits the needs of the majority leadership.

How long can this body continue to operate with a stacked deck? How long will it be before people begin to realize that the largest democratic body in the most democratic of nations operates under autocratic rule? That there are no rights for the minority in this House?

I submit, Mr. Speaker, that this charade will not go on indefinitely. The people watching us today, on TV sets in living rooms across the Nation, are aware of what is happening. They see the rules invoked against our rights as a minority. Even more important, they see the results of this tyranny; a budget which violates every rule of the House; a deficit which prevents people from buying homes; a national debt which our great-grandchildren will still be paying off; and a House which by its own rules shames the very concept of fair play and democratic rule.●

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mrs. VUCANOVICH) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. GROTEBERG, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MCDADE, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. EVANS of Illinois) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. ALEXANDER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. LANTOS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. ANNUNZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SOLARZ, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MARTINEZ, for 5 minutes, July 25.

Ms. OAKAR, for 60 minutes, July 30.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. COUGHLIN, following the remarks of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BROTHILL], on House Resolution 227, in the House, today.

Mr. DREIER of California, following the remarks of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. REGULA], on House Resolution 227, in the House, today.

Mrs. ROUKEMA, following the remarks of Mr. BARTLETT during consideration of H.R. 3038, in the Committee of the Whole, today.

Mr. GREEN, in support of the Whitten amendment during consideration of H.R. 3037, in the Committee of the Whole, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mrs. VUCANOVICH) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. SCHUETTE.

Mr. KEMP in three instances.

Mr. PORTER.

Mr. GROTEBERG.

Mr. GINGRICH.

Mr. BROOMFIELD.

Mr. ROTH.

Mr. COBEY.

Mr. JEFFORDS.

Mr. MICHEL in two instances.

Mr. HENDON.

Mr. GEKAS in two instances.

Mr. CRANE.

Mr. MCCAIN.

Mr. GREGG.

Mr. WYLLIE in two instances.

Mr. BOULTER.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. EVANS of Illinois) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. DURBIN.

Mr. RANGEL.

Mr. FASCELL in two instances.

Mr. KOLTER.

Mr. DYSON.

Mr. MATSUI.

Mr. HAMILTON.

Mr. STALLINGS.

Mr. COELHO in two instances.

Mr. HUBBARD.

Mr. MAVROULES.

Mr. FORD of Michigan.

Mr. GEJDESON.

Mr. VENTO.

Mr. SKELTON.

Mr. SCHUMER.

Mr. DOWNEY of New York.

Mr. LEVIN of Michigan.

Mr. AU COIN.

Mr. SMITH of Florida.

Mr. LEHMAN of Florida.

Mr. DWYER of New Jersey.

Mr. HOYER.

JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. ANNUNZIO, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his ap-

proval, a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H.J. Res. 106. Joint resolution designating August 1985 as "Polish American Heritage Month".

ADJOURNMENT

Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 43 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, July 25, 1985, at 10 o'clock a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1744. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to limit the price of scientific and technical reports sold by the Secretary of Commerce to their fair market value, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1745. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Assistance Agency, transmitting the Department of the Army's proposed Letter of Offer to Korea for defense articles and services estimated to cost \$53 million, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(b); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1746. A letter from the President of the United States, transmitting a report on the justification for request for appropriations to meet unexpected urgent refugee and migration needs, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2601(c)(3); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1747. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of State for Legislative and Intergovernmental Affairs, transmitting a report of political contributions for John Blane, of Illinois, as Ambassador to the Republic of Chad, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 3944(b)(2); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1748. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of State for Legislative and Intergovernmental Affairs, transmitting a report of political contributions for Richard W. Bogosian, of Maryland, as Ambassador to the Republic of Niger, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 3944(b)(2); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1749. A letter from the Administrator, Veterans Administration, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend title 38, United States Code, to clarify the authority of the Chief Medical Director or designee regarding disciplinary actions on certain probationary title 38 health care employees; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. FASCELL. Committee on Foreign Affairs. H.J. Res. 3 Joint resolution to prevent

nuclear explosive testing (Rept. No. 99-221. Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. DIXON. Committee on Appropriation. H.R. 3067. A bill making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1986, and for other purposes. (Rept. No. 99-223. Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. BURTON of California. Committee on Rules. H. Res. 235. A resolution providing for the consideration of H.J. Res. 187, a joint resolution to approve the "Compact of Free Association", and for other purposes. (Rept. No. 99-224. Referred to the House Calendar.

[Omitted from the Record of July 23, 1985]

REPORTED BILLS SEQUENTIALLY REFERRED

Under clause 5 of rule X, bills and reports were delivered to the Clerk for printing, and bills referred as follows:

Mr. MITCHELL. Committee on Small Business. H.R. 2540. A bill to authorize the appropriation of funds to the Small Business Administration, and for other purposes, with an amendment, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary for a period ending not later than September 24, 1985, for consideration of section 9 of the amendment. (Rept. No. 99-222, Pt. I). Ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 5 of rule X and clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. TORRICELLI (for himself, Mr. VOLKMER, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. FUQUA, Mr. LUJAN, and Mrs. SCHNEIDER):

H.R. 3065. A bill to amend the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 to authorize a program of research, development and demonstration for innovative or experimental treatment technologies for use in remedial actions; jointly, to the Committees on Energy and Commerce, Public Works and Transportation, and Science and Technology.

By Mr. YOUNG of Missouri (for himself, Mr. SHAW, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. GRAY of Illinois, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. STANGELAND, Mr. PETRI, and Mr. SUNDQUIST):

H.R. 3066. A bill to authorize the Architect of the Capitol to redesign and reconstruct the East Plaza of the U.S. Capitol in order to provide increased security and for esthetic purposes; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

By Mr. DIXON:

H.R. 3067. A bill making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1986, and for other purposes.

By Mr. BURTON of Indiana:

H.R. 3068. A bill to promote equitable personnel practices and to eliminate discrimination within the Federal civil service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DELLUMS:

H.R. 3069. A bill authorizing the President to issue a posthumous commission of brigadier general to Lt. Col. Charles E. Young, U.S. Army; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. DiOGUARDI:

H.R. 3070. A bill to provide housing assistance to the homeless through emergency food and shelter, renovation and conversion of facilities for use as shelters, and provision of housing and services in the transition to independent living; to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. GRAY of Illinois:

H.R. 3071. A bill to prevent the denial of employment opportunities by prohibiting the use of lie detectors by employers involved in or affecting interstate commerce; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 3072. A bill to direct the Administrator of General Services to renovate the public building at 425 Second Street, NW, in the District of Columbia for use as a homeless shelter; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

By Mr. GROTEBERG:

H.R. 3073. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide a mechanism for taxpayers to designate overpayments of income tax for purposes of reducing the public debt of the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JEFFORDS (for himself, Mr. VENTO, Mrs. SCHNEIDER, Mr. KOSTMAYER, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. MACKEY, and Mr. MARKEY):

H.R. 3074. A bill to grant the consent of Congress to two or more States to enter into compacts for the purpose of developing conservation and electric power plans and for other purposes and to delegate the authority to regulate certain rates for the sale of electricity at wholesale to the States; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. McDADE:

H.R. 3075. A bill to amend the Trade Act of 1974 to ensure reciprocal trade opportunities, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Ways and Means, Foreign Affairs, Energy and Commerce, Judiciary, and Rules.

By Mr. AuCOIN (for himself, Mr. ST GERMAIN, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. BOLAND, Mr. WYLLIE, Mr. McKINNEY, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. ANTHONY, Mr. ARCHER, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. BORSKI, Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. CARPER, Mr. CARR, Mr. CHANDLER, Mr. COELHO, Mr. COUGHLIN, Mr. DAUB, Mr. DICKS, Mr. DREIER of California, Mr. ERDREICH, Mr. FAUNTROY, Mr. FRANK, Mr. GREEN, Mr. GROTEBERG, Mr. HOYER, Mr. HILER, Mr. KANJORSKI, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. KEMP, Mr. KLECZKA, Mr. KOLBE, Mr. LaFALCE, Mr. LEHMAN of California, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. LOEFFLER, Mr. LUNDINE, Mr. MANTON, Mr. McCOLLUM, Mr. McDADE, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut, Mr. NELSON of Florida, Mr. SHUMWAY, Mr. TORRES, Mr. VANDER JAGT, Mr. WATKINS, Mr. WORTLEY, and Mr. WYDEN):

H.J. Res. 350. Joint resolution to designate the week of October 6, 1985, through October 13, 1985 as "National Housing Week"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BURTON of Indiana:

H.J. Res. 351. Joint resolution to condemn the government of Vietnam for violations of human rights; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GARCIA:
H.J. Res. 352. Joint resolution to designate November 11, 1985, as a day to honor the musical works of Irving Berlin; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MICA:
H.J. Res. 353. Joint resolution to provide that the funds appropriated for the Commission on the Ukrainian Famine shall remain available until expended; jointly, to the Committees on Foreign Affairs, and Appropriations.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BIAGGI:
H.R. 3076. A bill for the relief of Joseph-Paul Ferraro and Weiner Broadcasting Co.; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 56: Mr. GINGRICH, Mr. SPENCE, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. STUMP, and Mr. LEWIS of Florida.
H.R. 72: Mr. SLAUGHTER.
H.R. 79: Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire.
H.R. 147: Mr. HOWARD.
H.R. 237: Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. DELAY, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, and Mrs. LLOYD.
H.R. 580: Mr. MOODY, Mr. EDGAR, and Mr. MAZZOLI.
H.R. 976: Mr. DUNCAN.
H.R. 1207: Mr. CLAY.
H.R. 1284: Mr. OWENS, Mr. NEAL, and Mr. FEIGHAN.
H.R. 1353: Mr. LOWRY of Washington.
H.R. 1508: Mr. VENTO, Mr. HEFTTEL of Hawaii, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. CROCKETT, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. GOODLING, and Mr. WILSON.
H.R. 1591: Mr. NIELSON of Utah, Mr. CLINGER, Mr. PETRI, Mr. HENRY, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. SUNIA, and Mr. APPLIGATE.
H.R. 1616: Mr. HEFTTEL of Hawaii and Mr. MATSUI.
H.R. 1659: Mr. WRIGHT, Mr. GRAY of Pennsylvania, Ms. FIEDLER, Mr. ATKINS, Mr. BRYANT, Mr. HILER, Mr. JACOBS, Mr. KLECZKA, and Mr. LEVIN of Michigan.
H.R. 1719: Mr. BURTON of Indiana.
H.R. 1985: Mrs. SCHROEDER.
H.R. 2025: Mr. THOMAS of California, Mr. MINETA and, Mr. McCANDLESS.
H.R. 2119: Mr. LEHMAN of Florida and Mr. YATES.
H.R. 2162: Mr. LUNDINE.
H.R. 2226: Mr. LUKE.
H.R. 2337: Mr. OLIN.
H.R. 2472: Mr. SUNIA.
H.R. 2504: Mr. OWENS, Mr. STUDDS, Mr. O'BRIEN, Mr. UDALL, Mr. DASCHLE, Mr. MAVEROULES, Mr. WEAVER, Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut and Mr. SCHUMER.
H.R. 2522: Mr. MCKINNEY and Mr. SAVAGE.
H.R. 2578: Mrs. BENTLEY, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. DORNAN of California, Mr. HORTON, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. MRAZEK, Mr. NELSON of Florida, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. ROE, Mr. SHELBY, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, and Mr. WAXMAN.
H.R. 2587: Mr. HYDE, Mr. DARDEN and, Mr. MONSON.
H.R. 2589: Mr. FAZIO, Mr. MARTINEZ, and Mr. KOLTER.

H.R. 2620: Mr. CLAY and Mr. MILLER of California.

H.R. 2685: Mr. LEHMAN of Florida and Mr. LIPINSKI.

H.R. 2781: Mr. BURTON of Indiana.

H.R. 2866: Mr. MILLER of Ohio, Mr. GROTEBERG, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. PORTER, Mr. CHAPPIE, Mr. CONYERS, and Mr. TALLON.

H.R. 2999: Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. THOMAS of Georgia, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. TOWNS, Mrs. LLOYD, Mr. MITCHELL, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. McEWEN, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. KOSTMAYER, Mr. NIELSON of Utah, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. LELAND, Mr. SILJANDER, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mrs. COLLINS, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. SMITH of Florida, Mr. McGRATH, Mr. KOLBE, Mr. MOODY, Mr. ADDABBO, Mr. LUKE, Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut, Mr. KOLTER, Mrs. BENTLEY, Mr. RICHARDSON, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. MAVEROULES, Mr. FUSTER, Mr. STOKES, Mr. HUTTO, Mr. BARNARD, Mr. SCHAEFER, Mr. BOULTER, Mr. WEBER, Mr. GINGRICH, Mr. KASICH, Mr. MILLER of Washington, Mr. MARTIN of New York, Mr. SOLOMON, Mr. DORNAN of California, Mr. WHITEHURST, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. MRAZEK, Mr. LANTOS, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. BARNES, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Ms. OAKAR, Mr. WORTLEY, Mr. TRAXLER, Mr. FLORIO, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. PARRIS, Mr. LOWERY of California, Mr. COELHO, Mr. CHAPPELL, Mr. GALLO, Mr. MINETA, Mr. VENTO, Mr. CONTE, Mr. ECKART of Ohio, Mr. CHANDLER, Mr. FAUNTROY, and Mr. DWYER of New Jersey.

H.R. 3006: Mr. EDGAR.

H.R. 3050: Mr. HUTTO, Mr. ORTIZ, and Mr. CHAPPELL.

H.R. 3031: Mrs. HOLT.

H.J. Res. 112: Ms. SNOWE.

H.J. Res. 144: Mr. KRAMER.

H.J. Res. 200: Mr. SWIFT, Mr. TAUKE, Mr. LIGHTFOOT, Mr. BEDELL, Mr. EDGAR, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. EARLY, Mr. BOLAND, Mr. PURSELL, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. AKAKA, Mr. MINETA, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. BONIOR of Michigan, Mr. MORRISON of Washington, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. OWENS, Mr. O'BRIEN, Mr. McGRATH, Mr. BARNES, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. DARDEN, Mr. ROE, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. JACOBS, Mr. WOLF, Mr. SMITH of Florida, Mr. GINGRICH, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. ADDABBO, Mr. WEISS, Mr. HERTEL of Michigan, Mr. GRAY of Illinois, Mr. BUSTAMANTE, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. SABO, Mr. HEFTTEL of Hawaii, Mr. BEVILL, Mr. BRUCE, Ms. SNOWE, Mr. BLILEY, Mr. ST GERMAIN, Mr. GALLO, Mr. DONNELLY, Mr. DANNEMEYER, Mr. LUJAN, Mr. HARTNETT, Mr. KINDNESS, Mr. FRENZEL, Mr. DERRICK, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mrs. BURTON of California, Mr. DEWINE, Mr. COELHO, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. LA FALCE, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. KOLTER, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. STRATTON, Mr. JEFFORDS, Mr. BRYANT, Mrs. ROUKEMA, Mr. STANGELAND, Mr. GUARINI, Mr. KOSTMAYER, Mr. COUGHLIN, Mr. CROCKETT, Mr. EVANS of Iowa, Mr. MILLER of Washington, Mr. LOWRY of Washington, Mr. SHELBY, Mr. FLIPPO, Mr. DIXON, and Mr. CALLAHAN.

H.J. Res. 207: Mr. KEMP, Mr. DICKINSON, Mr. LIVINGSTON, Mr. RUDD, Mr. NICHOLS, Mr. SHAW, Mr. BLILEY, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. ROBERT F. SMITH, Mr. LIGHTFOOT, Mr. EDWARDS of Oklahoma, Mr. CLINGER, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. McEWEN, Mr. CRAIG, Mrs. ROUKEMA, Mr. LENT, Mr. RINALDO, Mr. GUNDERSON, Mr. McKERNAN, Mr. EVANS of Iowa, Mrs. COLLINS, Mr. ECKERT of New York, Mr. NIELSON of Utah, Mr. STANGELAND, Mr. CONTE, Mr. STRANG, Mr. HENRY, Mr. MACK, Mr. PACKARD, Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas, Mr. HILLIS, Ms. SNOWE, Mr. TAUKE, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. KRAMER, Mr. SKEEN, Mr. BROWN of Colorado, Mr. ROTH, Mr. LUJAN, Mr. BROYHILL, Mr.

EMERSON, Mr. STENHOLM, Mr. LUNGREN, Mr. THOMAS of California, Mr. McCOLLUM, Mr. STUMP, Mr. HOPKINS, Mr. McCANDLESS, Mr. MADIGAN, Mr. BLAZ, Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT, Mr. QUILLIN, Mr. COURTER, Mr. SLAUGHTER, Mr. PARRIS, Mr. GROTEBERG, Mr. HYDE, Ms. FIEDLER, and Mr. BURTON of Indiana.

H.J. Res. 259: Mr. HYDE, Mr. O'BRIEN, Mr. ROSE, Mr. DASCHLE, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. BEILENSON, Mr. WEISS, Mr. HEFTTEL of Hawaii, Mr. RUDD, Mr. LUNDINE, Mr. PUQUA, Mr. THOMAS of Georgia, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. DAUB, Mrs. BYRON, Mr. STANGLAND, Mr. BARNARD, Mr. HATCHER, Mr. CLINGER, Mrs. KENNELLY, Mr. VENTO, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. REID, Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. MINETA, Mr. HORTON, Mr. WORTLEY, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. EVANS of Illinois, Mr. FROST, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. BRYANT, Mr. GREEN, Mr. SABO, Mr. KEMP, Mr. BORSKI, Mr. RINALDO, Mr. CONTE, Mr. KASTENMEIER, Mr. TRAXLER, Mr. COURTER, Mr. DYMALLY, Mr. ADDABBO, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. DE LA GARZA, Mr. JEFFORDS, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. COOPER, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. BONER of Tennessee, Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. RAY, Mr. KINDNESS, Mr. NELSON of Florida, Mr. BADHAM, Mr. MAZZOLI, Mr. RITTER, Mr. COELHO, Mr. MORRISON of Washington, Mr. CARR, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. HERTEL of Michigan, Mr. BREAU, Mrs. VUCANOVICH, Mr. OWENS, Mr. WATKINS, Mr. LUNGREN, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. GARCIA, Mr. FISH, Mr. LA FALCE, Mr. BIAGGI, Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut, Mr. DORNAN of California, Mr. ATKINS, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. ROE, Mr. MCKINNEY, Mrs. HOLT, Mr. WILSON, Mr. EVANS of Iowa, and Mr. PANETTA.

H.J. Res. 296: Mr. SHELBY, Mr. SOLOMON, Mr. FISH, Mr. WORTLEY, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. CHANDLER, Mr. COYNE, Mr. MADIGAN, Mr. PURSELL, Mr. MCHUGH, and Mr. MOORHEAD.
H.J. Res. 305: Mrs. BOXER, and Mr. MADIGAN.

H.J. Res. 323: Mr. WILSON, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. STANGELAND, Mr. SUNIA, and Mr. MONSON.

H.J. Res. 333: Mr. TORRICELLI, Mr. DEWINE, Mr. VANDER JAGT, Mr. DANIEL, Mr. RINALDO, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. QUILLIN, Mr. LELAND, Mr. ANNUNZIO, Mr. STANGELAND, Mr. LUKE, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mrs. COLLINS, Mr. CHAPPIE, Mr. SHUMWAY, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. YOUNG of Missouri, Mr. HORTON, Mr. DAUB, Mr. WORTLEY, Mr. DE LA GARZA, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. FEIGHAN, Mr. JACOBS, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. SMITH of Florida, Mr. ROE, Mr. HOWARD, Mr. HOYER, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. ADDABBO, Mr. CROCKETT, Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, Mr. SUNIA, Mr. WEISS, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. KINDNESS, and Mr. CHANDLER.

H.J. Res. 336: Mr. KOSTMAYER, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. STARK, Mr. SNYDER, Mr. BEILENSON, Mr. HAYES, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut, Mr. MRAZEK, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. BARNES, Mr. FAUNTROY, Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. CROCKETT, Mr. SMITH of Florida, Mr. REID, Mrs. JOHNSON, Mr. DE LA GARZA, Mr. GARCIA, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. DELUMS, Mr. LEHMAN of Florida, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. MAVEROULES, Mr. HORTON, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. FORD of Michigan, Mr. TORRICELLI, Mr. LEVINE of California, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. REGULA, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. CARPER, Mr. LOWRY of Washington, Mrs. SCHNEIDER, Mr. HOWARD, Mr. SEIBERLING, Mr. BEDELL, Mr. LEACH of Iowa, Mr. SABO, Mr. McKERNAN, Mrs. SCHROEDER, Mr. ECKART of Ohio, Mr. TRAXLER, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. KASTENMEIER, Mr. STOKES, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. TAUKE, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. ROE, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. ADDABBO, Mr. MOAKLEY,

Mr. DOWNEY of New York, Mr. McCURDY, Mr. FOGLIETTA, and Mr. WEISS.

H.J. Res. 340: Mr. MOORHEAD.

H. Con. Res. 69: Mr. LUKEN.

H. Con. Res. 129: Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. BE-REUTER, Mr. COBLE, Mrs. KENNELLY, Mr. WEBER, Mr. HEFNER, Mr. DiOGUARDI, and Mr. KEMP.

H. Con. Res. 169: Mr. FAZIO, Mr. WEISS, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. SUNIA, Mr. BRUCE, Mr. LEHMAN of Florida, Mrs. BOXER, and Mr. FORD of Tennessee.

DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 821: Mr. BURTON of Indiana.

H.R. 2817: Mr. EVANS of Illinois.

AMENDMENTS

Under clause 6 of rule XXIII, proposed amendments were submitted as follows:

H.R. 3011

By Mr. COBEY:

—Page 13, line 6, strike out "\$104,069,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$104,469,000, of

which \$400,000 shall be for completion of restoration of Estey Hall in Raleigh, North Carolina".

By Mr. CONTE:

—Page 52, after line 8, insert the following:

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

ENERGY SECURITY RESERVE

(Rescission)

Except as otherwise provided in this section, all of the funds appropriated to the Energy Security are hereby rescinded. This rescission shall not apply to:

(1) funds transferred from the Energy Security Reserve by this Act;

(2) \$500,000,000, which may not be used for payments with respect to projects or modules under the Energy Security Act; and

(3) such amounts as may be necessary to make payments for projects or modules for which obligations were entered into under the Energy Security Act before the date of enactment of this Act.

H.R. 3038

By Mr. FRENZEL:

—Page 13, line 20, strike out "\$10,954,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$10,779,000".

—Page 15, line 7, strike out "\$7,759,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$7,635,000".

—Page 34, line 10, strike out "\$9,368,694,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$9,218,795,000".

—Page 34, line 15, strike out "\$195,840,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$192,707,000".

—Page 34, line 21, strike out "\$61,119,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$60,141,000".

—Page 35, line 7, strike out "\$760,547,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$748,378,000".

—Page 35, line 20, strike out "\$516,160,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$507,901,000".

—Page 37, line 15, strike out "\$144,400,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$142,090,000".

—Page 38, line 8, strike out "\$22,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$21,648,000".

—Page 38, line 13, strike out "\$3,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$2,952,000".

—Page 38, line 20, strike out "\$500,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$492,000".

—Page 39, line 8, strike out "\$235,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$231,240,000".

By Mr. HENRY:

—Page 31, after line 9, insert the following new item:

NSF APPROPRIATIONS CEILING

Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, the total amount appropriated under this Act for the National Science Foundation shall be \$1,501,800,000.

—Page 27, after line 21, insert the following new item:

NASA APPROPRIATIONS CEILING

Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, the total amount appropriated under this Act for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration shall be \$7,510,000,000.